UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

PUBLIC WORKSHOPS EXPLORING COMPETITION IN AGRICULTURE

Poultry Work Shop

May 21, 2010

9:12 a.m.

Alabama A&M University Knight Reception Center Normal, Alabama

1	$\underline{A} \ \underline{P} \ \underline{P} \ \underline{E} \ \underline{A} \ \underline{R} \ \underline{A} \ \underline{N} \ \underline{C} \ \underline{E} \ \underline{S}$			
2	WELCOME/INTRODUCTORY COMMENTS:			
3	The Honorable Eric Holder, Attorney General, U. S. Department of Justice.			
4	The Honorable Tom Vilsack, Secretary			
5	of the Agriculture, U. S. Department of Agriculture.			
6	ROUNDTABLE DISCUSSION AND PRESENTATION OF			
7	ISSUES:			
8	The Honorable Eric Holder, Attorney General, U. S. Department of Justice.			
9	-			
10	The Honorable Tom Vilsack, Secretary of Agriculture, U. S. Department of			
11	Agriculture.			
12	The Honorable Christine Varney, Assistant Attorney General for Antitrust, U. S. Department of Justice.			
13				
14	The Honorable Artur Davis, Congressman, U. S. House of Representatives.			
15	The Honorable Ron Sparks, Commissioner			
16	of Agriculture, State of Alabama.			
17	ROUNDTABLE DISCUSSION ON POULTRY PRODUCER			
18	CONCERNS:			
19	The Honorable Tom Vilsack, Secretary of Agriculture, U.S. Department of			
20	Agriculture.			
21	Gary Alexander, Producer, Westminster, South Carolina.			
22	Kay Doby, Former Producer, Cameron, North Carolina.			
23				

Robert Lunzy, Former Producer, Columbia, Mississippi.		
Sandra Genell Pridgen, Producer, North Carolina.		
Garry Staples, Producer, Steele, Alabama.		
Shane Wooten, Producer, Henagar, Alabama.		
PUBLIC TESTIMONY.		
Taba Barrall Darrata IIndara Carratarra		
John Ferrell, Deputy Under Secretary for Marketing and Regulatory Programs, U. S. Department of Justice.		
William Stallings, Assistant Section Chief, Transportation, Energy and Agriculture Section, U. S. Department of Justice.		
Norman Familant, Chief Economic		
Litigation Section, U. S. Department of Justice.		
Benny Bishop, Peco Foods, Tuscaloosa,		
Alabama.		
Max Carnes, Producer, Baldwin, Georgia.		
Michael R. Dicks, Watkins Chair, International Trade and Development, Oklahoma State University.		
John Ingrum, Forest, Mississippi.		
Cindy Johnson, Attorney, Cohutta,		

1 Georgia. 2 Robert Taylor, Professor, Agricultural Economics and Public Policy, College of 3 Agriculture, Auburn University. Mike Weaver, Producer and President of 4 Contract Poultry Growers Association of the 5 Virginias, Fort Seybert, West, Virginia. 6 ADDITIONAL PUBLIC TESTIMONY. 7 John Ferrell, Deputy Under Secretary for Marketing and Regulatory Programs, U. 8 S. Department of Justice. 9 William Stallings, Assistant Section Chief, Transportation, Energy and Agriculture Section, U. S. Department of 10 Justice. 11 DUDLEY BUTLER, U. S. Department of 12 Agriculture. 13 CLOSING REMARKS: 14 John Ferrell, Deputy Under Secretary for Marketing and Regulatory Programs, U. 15 S. Department of Justice. 16 William Stallings, Assistant Section Chief, Transportation, Energy and 17 Agriculture Section, U. S. Department of Justice. 18 DUDLEY BUTLER, U. S. Department of 19 Agriculture. 20 21 22 23

1		INDEX	
2	<u>Panel</u> :		<u>Page</u>
3			
4	WELCOME/ COMMENTS	INTRODUCTORY	7
5			
6		BLE DISCUSSION AND ATION OF ISSUES	23
7		BLE DISCUSSION ON PRODUCER CONCERNS	65
8			
9		TESTIMONY	
10	TOM GREE		154 156
11	CRAIG WA WARREN G	GRANGER	162 165
12		AR JACKSON	168 169 172
13	MR. ROBB	CEY BLOCKS BIE STAULT	174
14	MS. VALE	IK MORRISON ERIE ROW LIAM CRAMER	175 177 178
15	MS. ANGI	E TYLER	181
16	MR. ANDY	S SANDERS STONE	184 186
17	MR. BRUC SHEILA	CE FAULT	191 192
18	MR. TOMM	ES SHACKLEFORD MY HINES	195 197
19		/E ADCOCK J. HYDE	199 202
20		R HOLCOMB Z GOOLSBY	203 206
21		Y KUSHNER	219
∠ ⊥		ALD WALKER CIA HARVIE	222 224
22		RY TUCKER	227
23	MR. BRAD UNIDENTI	CAINEY FIED SPEAKER	230 232

1	ROUND TABLE DISCUSSION ON TRENDS IN POULTRY PRODUCTION	236
2	ADDITIONAL PUBLIC TESTIMONY	
3	MS. LESLIE HAYES	345
4	MR. FRED PARRISH	351
5		355 358
6		363 365
7	MR. DONALD RAY WILKES	370 372
8	MR. ALTON TERRY MR. MIKE WEAVER	374 378
9	MR. MARK HUDSON	380
10	CLOSING REMARKS	384
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		

PROCEEDINGS

2 May 21, 2010

9:12 a.m.

SECRETARY VILSACK: Well, good morning. I'm Tom Vilsack, Secretary of Agriculture. And I'm certainly pleased to be here at Alabama A&M University and appreciate all the folks that are here today.

I want to welcome everyone to this Joint Competition Workshop between the Department of Agriculture and the Department of Justice. It's an historic opportunity for us to listen and to learn.

Congressman, good to see you.

I want to thank the folks at Alabama A&M University for allowing us to use this facility and everyone who has provided assistance to us.

I also want to recognize several members of the United Food and Commercial Workers, as well as those from the retail, wholesale and department store unions that are joining us today.

1 This is, as I said, the second in 2 the series of competition workshops we are 3 holding this year to allow us to better understand the issues of most concern and 4 5 deserve closer attention and to explore the appropriate role, if any, for antitrust or 6 7 regulatory enforcement in the agricultural 8 area. 9 In March we held a workshop on 10 general farmer issues in Ames, Iowa. 11 Today we're focusing on 12 competition and contracting practices in 13 the broiler industry, as well as the 14 relationship between producers and 15 companies. 16 On June 25th we will hold a 17 workshop on dairy in Madison, Wisconsin. 18 We will evaluate the competition 19 on livestock markets on August 27th in Fort 20 Collins, Colorado. 21 And we'll discuss margins on 22 December 8th in Washington, D.C.

President Obama has provided

23

clear direction on that his government should be open and transparent. And that's what he hope these workshops are designed to do. We seriously want public dialogue on these very complex issue.

As I travel as Secretary of
Agriculture across the country I hear a
very consistent theme, farmers and ranchers
and producers are worried about whether
there's a future for themselves and their
children in agriculture.

And we know having a viable market largely determines if such a future will exist.

Farmers have the right to know if their markets are fair, competitive and transparent, especially if they're going to make a significant investment to allow them to get in and to stay in agriculture.

At the same time, consumers across the country have the right to know whose products they're buying are safe and are fairly priced at the grocery store.

At the Iowa workshop we discussed whether there was enough innovation and competition in the seed industry.

We also looked at the spot market in hogs, which has become very thin and volatile and making it more difficult to actively price hogs.

Today we evaluate the poultry industry, and, specifically, the broiler portion of the industry.

As those in the audience probably well know in the 1950's and '60's the poultry industry underwent one of the largest transformations of any sector in agriculture through consolidation and vertical integration.

Poultry production is vertically integrated. The company owns the birds, the feed, medications, veterinary services, whereas, the growers take on the capital cost of building the facilities, helping to pay the fuel costs and caring for the birds to market weight.

1 Most production is supplied 2 through poultry growing arrangements 3 between the company and growers. In 1963 the top four firms 4 5 controlled 14% of chickens slaughtered. 6 Today it's roughly 57%. And now it's not uncommon for a 7 8 grower to have to do business with only one company in their area. 9 10 Also been increasing 11 controversies between poultry growers and 12 processors, specifically relating to the 13 length of contracts and contract terms. 14 The concentration numbers fail to 15 answer the basic question, which we want to 16 hear from you today: What is needed to have a viable, fair and competitive 17 18 marketplace? 19

The issues surrounding the competitiveness in agriculture have been debated for decades. And there's no doubt that they are difficult and complex, which is why this workshop is important and, we

20

21

22

23

believe, long overdue.

2.

We continue to seek answers and solutions. The Administration is very aware of the concerns that producers have about market concentration. And we've already taken a number of steps.

The USDA and the Department of Justice have established the Agricultural Competition Joint Task Force to explore opportunities to harness each other's expertise and will be developing a new memorandum of understanding that will outline our relationship.

These workshops will help inform us as we work on this with you.

The president's budget in the ag area has increased GIPSA's funding level to improve enforcement over unfair and deceptive practices in the marketplace.

The department is using these resources to hire attorneys to handle complex competition investigations as well as other violations.

The current budget the President has proposed to Congress for 2011 also requests additional funds to hire legal specialists and field investigators to help conduct more than 500 inspections to ensure that the market is fair and above board.

We published a final rule in December of 2009 to include fairness in contracting in the poultry industry.

Specifically this final rule ensures that growers are provided a 90-day notice before a company can terminate their contracts.

It also ensures that growers, who were building new poultry houses, get to see a -- a true written contract on the date the poultry company provides the poultry house specifications, not months later, which could put the grower in a thicket or leave of the situation.

The final rule also spells out that the growers have the right to discuss their contracts with their families, their

lender, their state or federal agencies,
their lawyer or other growers that contract
with the same company.

We are also in the final clearance for a proposed rule which we intend to issue sometime in mid June to carryout the requirements of the 2008 Farm Bill that addresses issues of fairness in contracting in the livestock and the poultry marketplace.

Again, I want to thank you-all for attending today.

And I want to thank the panelists in advance, before my introductions of them, for their willingness to participate in this workshop. And we look forward to hearing what they have to say on this very important issues in agriculture.

It's now my distinct pleasure to introduce the Attorney General of the United States, Eric Holder.

During his impressive career

General Holder as served in the private

1 practice as a U. S. Attorney for the 2. District of Columbia; as an Associate Judge 3 of the Superior of the District of Columbia 4 and as a Deputy Attorney General. 5 He has worked to investigate and 6 prosecute official corruption on the local, state and federal level. 7 And he's fully invested in strong 8 enforcement of our nation's antitrust laws 9 10 to advance the interest of justice on 11 behalf of the American people. On a personal note, I want to 12 13 indicate the personal attention the 14 Attorney General has paid to these 15 particular workshops. There are many 16 places that the Attorney General could be today, but he has dedicated himself to 17 18 coming to these workshops as an indication 19 of his concern and interest. 20 So please welcome -- join me in 21 welcoming Attorney General Holder. 22 ATTORNEY GENERAL HOLDER: Well,

23

good morning.

1 Thank you, Secretary Vilsack.

It's always good to join with you. And it's good to be here and it's also good to be out of Washington, D. C.

Seated to my left is the
Assistant Attorney General for the
Antitrust Division in the United States
Department of Justice, a woman who has
revitalized the antitrust division and who
-- from whom you'll be hearing later,
Christine Varney.

You might hear in me a slight New York accent, but it's always great to be in the beautiful State of Alabama. I consider you-all my second home. My wife was born and raised about five hours south of here in Mobile, Alabama, but this is my first visit to -- to Normal.

So I want to thank the city and our host, Alabama A&M, for welcoming us today and for hosting what I think is a very important workshop.

The discussion that we have

gathered to begin reflects, I think, a
historic collaboration, as Secretary
Vilsack said, between the Departments of
Justice and Agriculture and leaders from
across our nation's agricultural industry.
Secretary Vilsack, Assistant
Attorney General Varney and I are committed
to improving our understanding of how

to improving our understanding of how particular agricultural markets function.

That is why we are here.

And that's why we've decided to hold a series of five workshops across the country to hear from people, to examine the challenges facing America's farmers, growers and producers.

Now, two months ago we kicked off this workshop series in Secretary Vilsack's home State of Iowa, I wonder how that happened, where we focused on the seed industry. That meeting, I think, was a great success.

We received very valuable feedback from those who attended and from

those who provided written comments.

Now, I fully expect that this workshop will be just as useful. Not only do we appreciate your input, quite frankly, we need your input, we need to hear from you.

And today our goal is to develop a -- a clearer picture of what competitive issues, participants in the poultry market are facing, but we need your perspective.

Your insights can help us fulfill our responsibilities to take appropriate action to enforce the Packers and Stockyard Act.

It will also enable us to be more effective advocates for competition, which is Christine's job.

Now, as we begin this important conversation it is fitting that we've gathered here at Alabama A&M. This university has a very long and a very distinguished tradition of training agricultural leaders. And today is on the

cutting edge of industry and industry advancements.

In fact, as we speak, university biotechnologists are making strides in the development of an allergy free peanut.

Now, this is something very important to me. I've got two children who are allergic to peanuts. And if you can pull this off, I will be able to give peanut butter sandwiches to everybody in my family.

But in learning about this, I couldn't help but think about George Washington Carver, who spent his career working on innovations with peanuts at Tuskegee University.

Doctor Carver once said, and I quote, "New developments are the products of a creative mind".

Well, that is certainly true, but
I believe that new developments, and more
importantly, progress, are also the product
of collaboration.

1 Now, in coming together today our hope is that we can move forward in meeting 2 3 our goals to ensure competition, to ensure 4 opportunity and fairness in our 5 agricultural markets. Secretary Vilsack, Assistant 6 7 Attorney General Varney and I understand 8 that. 9 As farmers, producers and 10 industry leaders we understand that you 11 face a variety of challenges. 12 We know that some of you have 13 concerns about production contracts. 14 Others are worried about consolidation in 15 our poultry markets. 16 Whether you're hear to talk about 17 antitrust issues or to raise questions 18 about fair contracting and business 19 practices, we really look forward to 20 hearing from each of you. 21 Now, with your engagement, I 22 believe that we can move closer to 23 answering the question that's at the heart

of these workshops.

The question of whether competition in today's agricultural industry is as free and is as fair as it should be.

And as we work to answer this and understand why a growing number of American producers and farmers find it increasingly difficult to survive by doing what they have been doing for decades.

I want to ensure each of you that the Obama Administration is committed to protecting competition in a very vigorous manner. This is a top priority for today's Department of Justice.

But I recognize that the vigorous enforcement of our antitrust laws, while critical, cannot fully address the concerns of many agricultural industry leaders and stakeholders. That's why we're partnering with the United States Department of Agriculture to benefit from its deep expertise in your industry and, hopefully,

to share our expertise on the more regulatory issues that are potentially at play.

And that's why our agencies launched the Agricultural Competition Joint Task Force that Secretary Vilsack mentioned.

That's also why we're engaging directly with all of you, to listen, to learn and to determine the best way to ensure fairness and to encourage success.

Now, as we evaluate and develop policy we want to hear from you. And I think that's something that all of us would really stress, we want to hear from you.

In fact, when we announced these workshops last year, we also issued a call for your comments and recommendations.

And, so far, the response has really been tremendous. To date we have received over 15,000 comments. And I'm grateful that so many of you have contributed to this extraordinary example

1 of government, the public engagement at its 2 best. 3 Not only must we keep up this 4 work, we have to expand this work. 5 together, I believe, that we can address 6 these 21st Century challenges that the 7 agricultural industry now faces. 8 Now, I'm certain that we can 9 honor and preserve your industry's 10 essential role in our economy as well as 11 our culture, our livelihood and our global 12 standing. 13 Your participation here gives me 14 great hope about what we can accomplish 15 together in the days and -- and months 16 ahead. 17 Secretary Vilsack and I look 18 forward to hearing from you and to working 19 with all of you. 20 So thank you so much for 21 welcoming us here today. And, as I said, 22 we look forward to hearing from all of you.

SECRETARY VILSACK:

General,

23

1 thank you very much.

Let me explain what we're going to do this morning. We are initially going to have an opportunity to hear from Christine Varney that the Attorney General briefly introduced.

Congressman Artur Davis is here with us, as well as Commissioner Sparks.

We're going to have an opportunity to ask a few questions of this panel.

We will break for a short period of time and reconvene a larger panel of producers and growers and have the same kind of question and answer format as the morning session.

Then I think we turn it over to -- to General Varney for the afternoon session, which will give folks additional panel discussions and opportunities for Q and A.

We do want this to be as interactive as we possibly can have. And we do want to hear from as many people as

1 we can.

Let me first and foremost introduce very briefly the three members of the first panel. And then I will turn to the Attorney General for questions and to each of the individual panelists for questions so that they can make a statement in response.

As the General indicated,
Christine Varney was confirmed as an
Assistant Attorney General for the
Antitrust Division in April of 2009.

She has held leadership positions in both public and private sector.

From 1998 to 2009 she was a partner in Hogan and Preston, a very significant and prestigious firm in Washington, D. C., where she served in a dual capacity as a member of the firm's antitrust practice group and the head of the Internet practice group.

From '94 to '97, 1994 to 1997, she served as a Federal Trade Commissioner

at the Federal Trade Commission. She was the leading official on a wide variety of Internet and competition issues.

Prior to her service there she served as an Assistant to the President and Secretary to the Cabinet during the Clinton Administration.

She is joined by Congressman

Artur Davis, no stranger to the folks here.

The Congressman ws reelected in 2008 to

serve his fourth term in the U. S. House of

Representatives. And he represents the

Seventh Congressional District here in

Alabama and serves as a member of the Ways

and Means Committee.

He is a member of the Congressional Black Caucus and resides in Birmingham, Alabama.

He was also appointed to the senior whip team for the Democratic Congress of the Hundredth and Ninth Congress. And is the co-chair of the Sentrus House, New Democrat Coalition, as

1 well as the Southern Regional Co-chair of 2. the Democratic Congressional Campaign Committee. 3 4 Congressman Davis and I became 5 first acquainted as a result of relationship on the Democratic Leadership 6 7 Counsel. 8 Joining the Congressman is the Honorable Ron Sparks who serves as your 9 10 Commissioner of Agriculture and Industries. 11 First elected in 2002. He's then won 12 reelection to a second term in 2006. 13 In 1999 Commissioner Sparks was appointed Assistant Commissioner of 14 15 Agricultural and Industry. 16 He has completed terms as 17 President of the Southern Association of 18 State Departments of Agriculture. 19 And most recently served as the 20 President of the National of State 21 Departments of Agriculture. 22 Commissioner Sparks continues to 23 serve with that commission on the executive committee. And that is an opportunity that
we look forward to each month to visit from
the USDA with the state ag commissioners
and secretaries to make sure that we have a
seamless communication system.

So these are the three panelists.

And I think, General, if I could start with you and -- and give you a chance to sort of expand a little bit more.

I clearly want to thank you for attending this workshop and certainly appreciate you collaboration your department is providing with our department, it's truly historic.

As you know, and as the folks in this room probably know, poultry enforcement under the Packers and Stockyards Act is divided between our two agencies. This makes, I think, communication and coordination very critical.

In years past growers have been frustrated of what they feel is a lack of

coordination and a sense that no one will help them.

Do you have a sense about what we can do to improve the communication and coordination with respect to this important issue?

attorney General Holder: Well, I certainly -- one thing -- one of the things we have to do is exactly what we are doing now, which is to give people an opportunity to interact with those people like ourselves who have the responsibility for running the departments that are -- have, as their responsibility, enforcement of -- of that act.

I think we also have to come up with ways in which we interact with each interact in ways, frankly, better than we have in the past.

I don't think the Department of Justice, again, quite frankly, has been nearly as active as it needed to be.

We have tried to reach out to our

counterparts at the Department of

Agriculture and to establish what, I think,

is in some ways a historic relationship

with an understanding of the expertise that

we can bring to these questions and with a

respect for the deep expertise and

experiences the Department of Agriculture

has in this regard.

It seems to me that without all of the relevant agencies of the Executive Branch actually functioning, working -- working together, speaking with one another, we're not going to be in a position to give you-all the kind of service, frankly, the kind of government that you deserve, the kind of effective action that I think this government is capable of providing.

And, so, that is why we are here, but it is also why when we leave and when we are back in Washington the communication between our departments will -- will continue.

1 SECRETARY VILSACK: General, 2 thanks very much. 3 And for the purposes of the group 4 here today, I want to make one introduction of a USDA official, primarily because 5 6 they're difficult questions relating to the 7 Packers and Stockyards Act. I want Dudley Butler -- Dudley, 8 9 do you want to stand up, who is in charge 10 of that area to be able to answer them. 11 So that's the man you want to go 12 to. 13 MR. BUTLER: Thank you. SECRETARY VILSACK: I don't think 14 15 I just did you a favor, Dudley. 16 I want to now turn to Congressman 17 Davis. 18 Congressman, just from your vast 19 awareness and knowledge as you travel 20 around in your congressional district in 21 the state, your thoughts about competition 22 in the poultry industry and what, perhaps, 23 needs to happen in order to make sure that

1 everyone is being treated fairly. 2 CONGRESSMAN DAVIS: Thank you, 3 Mr. Secretary. And let me begin by just greeting 4 5 you and the Attorney General. Mr. Secretary, you may recall several years ago 6 7 after our DLC partnership you came to the 8 State of Alabama and you had a chance to 9 talk to some Democrats in Jefferson County. 10 And it was good to see you then. 11 And, Mr. Attorney General, it's 12 always good welcome you come back to your 13 kind of, sort of adopted state. 14 Some of you may remember the 15 Attorney General honored the State of Alabama in 2009, only few weeks after his 16 17 being sworn in as the first 18 African-American Attorney General of the 19 United States he came to Selma, Alabama. 20 And he honored history and he honored the 21 whole state by standing in the pulpit of 22 Brown's Chapel on Jubilee Sunday. 23 And, Mr. Attorney General,

people continue to remember that visit, not quite as much as they remember Barack Obama coming, but you're a close second. And it meant a lot that you came that day and I

thank you for that again.

Let me -- before I answer your question, I want to pay tribute to both of these individuals who are seated to my immediate left because of something the U. S. Congress is about to do, but it would not have happened without the leadership of Secretary Vilsack and Attorney General Holder.

Some of you in this room have a vital interest in a fair and just resolution of the Pigford Case that has consumed some many people and so many families for close to 20 years now.

Several years ago working with Democrats and Republicans in Congress we managed to reopen the Pigford litigation and included those provisions in the Bipartisan 2008 Farm Bill.

Well, earlier this year Secretary
Vilsack and Attorney General Holder made an
announcement that this long running, long
festering stain of the agricultural system
of the United States was ready to be
settled.
And I'm happy to sit here and

And I'm happy to sit here and report to you that in Congress' final days before the Memorial Day recess the House of Representatives is poised to pass legislations that will include a 1.4 billion dollar settlement for Pigford litigants that would not have happened without the vision of this Attorney General, this Agriculture Secretary and this President.

So please give them a hand for that accomplishment.

Let me go to directly to the Secretary's question.

Mr. Secretary, the best way I can answer that question is to share with you a brief anecdote that I recall from my

travels around this state several years
ago.

I was attending a farmer's conference. And, candidly I did not profess myself to be an expert on poultry farming, I was there to learn and to listen. I said my piece. And then at the end I -- I took questions, did more listening than talking.

As I was about to leave, and I did what we politicians are always reluctant to do and says, is there any one person who hasn't had a chance to speak who wants to get in?

There's a gentleman from North
Alabama who made his way to the microphone.
He said, Mr. Davis, I'm a poultry farmer.
Been a poultry farmer for 33 years.

My son is 22. He is graduating
Auburn University. A very fine school in
East Alabama, Mr. Secretary. And he said
my son came to me a few weeks ago and said,
"You know, dad, you've been a poultry for

32 years. I have decided that I want to follow in your footsteps and I want to be a poultry farmer".

The gentleman looked out at the audience and said, Mr. Davis, the first thing I did was I said to my son, "Well, I'm going to put together a list of contacts that you may want to talk to", you know, as dads and sons kind of always work together. So I'll put together a list of contacts I want you to talk to.

And then he said something that stunned everybody in the room, he said, "I had no intention of calling a single one of those contacts on behalf of my son".

Everyone got quiet. And he said
I waited, I let several weeks go by and my
son came back and said, "Dad, have you
heard from any of those guys, you know,
that you said I needed to talk to about
getting into the poultry business"?

And this gentleman said to us that day that he kept giving his son the

runaround.

And everyone is sitting there wondering why would a father give his son the runaround when his son was trying to go into the family business.

The gentleman looked out at all of us that day, about a hundred and fifty people and said, "Mr. Davis, I have done this for 32 years. I do not have the confidence that my can make it in the poultry business. I know he's smart. I know he has everything he needs in terms of work ethic. I know he has the character, my wife and I taught him that, but I do not have confidence he can make it in the family business".

And I remember everyone in that room was sitting there wondering have we gotten to a state in farming and agriculture in the State of Alabama where when a son wants to walk in his father's footsteps the son doesn't feel empowered to take his son along that path.

1 We have a lot of poultry farmers 2 who are here today. I suspect, General 3 Holder, Secretary Vilsack if we had a 4 chance to inventory some of them -- I don't 5 know if that gentleman is here, he may not 6 be, but I suspect there's stories like his 7 in this room. 8 And I didn't have a chance to 9 quiz him or to cross examine him about why 10 he didn't have confidence that his son 11 could make it. 12 Maybe it's high energy costs. 13 Maybe it's the difficulty of 14 sustaining a small business because running 15 a farm is running a small business as all 16 of you appreciate. 17 Maybe it's the lack of 18 competition. 19 Maybe it's predatory pricing. 20 Maybe it's predatory 21 relationships between producers and 22 management. 23 I didn't cross examine him on

those things that day, but that man in that room communicated a pain in his voice.

And all of us who care about the future of this state and the future of this region have to understand that we cannot walk away from our farms.

The reality is that in this state farms have lost 76% of their value over the last decade.

That means Alabama is hurting because we're not fully maximizing what our farms can do.

So I'm glad to see the Attorney

General and the Secretary of Agriculture

fully engaged in this very unique

partnership because I want men, like the

individual who stood up at that meeting, to

be able to say, I welcome my son into the

poultry profession. I welcome my son into

the family business. I'm confident he can

make it. I'm confident he can thrive.

There's something fundamentally wrong when a father has to say to a son do

1 not walk the path that I walked. 2 The final comments I'll make, Mr. 3 Secretary. We have the outstanding new 4 president of this school, Doctor Hugine, 5 who is here today, who's seated on the 6 first. We have a pretty good crowd of 7 folk. 8 Everyone in this room ought to 9 appreciate, it is not an accident or 10 coincidence that we're Alabama A&M. 11 J.C. likes to say they could be in anyplace 12 in the world right now. Some of y'all got 13 that. 14 They could be in a number of 15 places in Alabama. 16 They could be at Auburn. 17 They could be at AUM. 18 They could have gone to Selma. 19 They could have found an excuse 20 to do this in Birmingham because the 21 flights get into Birmingham more easily 22 sometimes. 23 But they're here, Doctor Hugine,

at this school, which has meant so much to 1 Northeast Alabama. For anyone who doubts 2 3 that Alabama A&M is 100% on its way, that Alabama A&M is one of the proudest 4 5 institutes in this region, turn around and 6 look behind you and see what Alabama A&M 7 can do. Doctor Hugine, it's a tribute to 8 9 your leadership that we're today. 10 Thank you so much. 11 SECRETARY VILSACK: And, 12 actually, Congressman, we were planning a 13 competition hearing on football at one of 14 those other universities. That will come 15 later. Commissioner, I want to turn to 16 17 You obviously have your ear to the 18 ground with Alabama agriculture and 19 agriculture generally. 20 I'm just curious, and I think the 21 General is curious, in knowing your 22 thoughts about what we can to do to make

sure that this playing field is level for

1 the growers and producers and how can we 2 potentially strengthen their position so 3 that this playing field is as level as it 4 can be so that a father has a chance to say 5 to his son you can participate in this business. 6 7 COMMISSIONER SPARKS: Absolutely. 8 And, Mr. Secretary, you're on 9 your own when you start mentioning football 10 in Alabama, okay. 11 The first thing I want to do is 12 certainly thank Alabama A&M. It is great 13 to be back in North Alabama. 14 Mr. Secretary, I'm one of the 15 fortunate commissioners in this country 16 where I have three land grant universities 17 with Alabama A&M, Tuskegee and Auburn. And 18 I am very proud of all three of them. 19 they do yoeman's work for agriculture in 20 this state. And I just want to -- I'm very 21 proud of them and I appreciate them.

And I want to thank you personally for taking your time to come to

22

Alabama, along with General Holder. This
means a lot to -- to us in Alabama.

And thank you Assistant Secretary

Varney -- General.

This means so much for you come to Alabama and talk in my opinion, to some of the best farmers you'll ever meet.

I've had the privilege of working with industry and agriculture in this state now for 11 years. And I can tell you it has been a great ride to be able to work with these gentleman.

But, you know, there's a key word when we start talking about contracts, we start talking about farmers, we start talking about agriculture, and that key word is profitability.

Profitability -- it's hard to keep anybody in business if they don't see a way to make a living. And that's the struggle that farmers have today is to try to figure out how they're going to make a living and how they're going to make ends

1 meet.

And General Holder when you started quoting Doctor George Washington Carver it makes me feel good because in many of these individuals that's ever heard me speak I talk about Doctor George Washington Carver also.

And Doctor George Washington said a man with no vision is a man with no hope.

And that's why all of these people are here today because they do have vision and do they have hope and they want to support their families and they want to support agriculture.

The poultry industry is extremely important to Alabama. It's over a two billion dollar industry.

The way I view the poultry industry, it is a partnership. It is a partnership of farmers, a partnership of companies.

And what I have learned as Commissioner of Agriculture for the past

1 s 2 p 3 A 4 w 5 6 i 7 1 8 t 9 i i

seven years is that sometimes in a lot of partnerships communication breaks down.

And when communication breaks down that's where the hardship and the difficulties come because many of these farmers that invest in the poultry industry invest their lives, they invest their home, they invest their land, they invest their future, they invest their kids' future, they invest there kids' eduction.

And when there's a lack of communication of not understanding each other, and the troubles that they're going through, then it creates adversity.

And that's what I would hope that we can get out of this meeting today, is that farmers understand companies and companies understand farmers and we find a way to move this industry forward in a very positive time way because the poultry industry is a great industry, but they are going through some very difficult times when it comes to the investment of their

1 home, the price that builds, utility costs, 2 labor costs, but, on the other hand, companies are going through those similar 3 4 issues. 5 So I would hope that through all 6 -- all of this today that we find some 7 common ground. That companies communicate better with our farmers and that farmers 8 9 communicate better with our companies and 10 that we find a way to move this business 11 forward because without each other there is 12 no poultry industry. 13 We've got to have each other to 14 make this industry work. And we've got to 15 understand what each other are going 16 through. 17 The technology. And I think we 18 need to find a way to reward good farmers 19 that use the technology that these great 20 land grant universities afford them. 21 So that's -- that's where I would

There is a great risk for farmers

22

23

hope.

1 and there's a great risk for companies. 2 And we've just got to find a common ground and the communication that allows us to 3 4 move on. 5 SECRETARY VILSACK: Commissioner, 6 thank you very much. 7 I think it's important for us to 8 reflect, not just on the industry's significance to farmers, but also on the 9 10 industry's significance to consumers. 11 Very few people in America 12 appreciate what American agriculture and the food industry provides to them. 13 14 Every single one of us has 15 probably 10 to 15% more disposal income in 16 our pockets from our hard earned paychecks 17 by virtue of the fact that we have the 18 least expensive food as a percentage of 19 income of any developed nation in the 20 world. 21 So Americans have this 22 extraordinary opportunity to maybe buy a

nicer house or a car or go on a vacation in

1 large part because those food dollars are
2 stretched so far in this country.

And, so, it is important for us to continue to support farmers.

And, General, and -- and
Assistant Attorney General Varney you might
find it interesting to know that -- that
these farmers out here, if you took a look
at their total farm income, family farm
income across the country, only 9% of it
last year came from farming operations,
which means that 91% had to come from some
other place, which means that these people,
in many cases, are working more than the
farming job they have, they're working off
the farm or their spouse is working off the
farm or they're both working off the farm.

So, Commissioner, your comments are -- are certainly important.

And you brought up the issue of communication. And I think, as the General indicated, that the departments have to do a better job of communicating. And,

certainly, the USDA has the responsibility
to -- to -- to be a better communicator,
both with farmers, as well as the
Department of Justice.

And I'd like to ask the Assistant Attorney General who is really spearheading this effort. Maybe you could -- maybe you can tell us a little bit more about the enforcement matters the antitrust division handles and -- and how poultry enforcement is actually handled in the department in the sense of your role in all of this.

ASSISTANT ATTORNEY GENERAL

VARNEY: Thank you, Secretary. And thank
you President for having us here at this
wonderful university. It's delightful to
be here.

Let me start by saying that when we raised the idea of doing these hearings to better understand what the issues were, the intersection between agriculture and USDA policy and the Department of Justice policy, both Secretary Vilsack and General

Holder immediately said, yes, when are 1 2 they, we're going. 3 So from the highest level of the Obama Administration this has been 4 5 something that we care deeply about. 6 And you might recall at our last 7 hearing in Iowa, which was the one where we kicked this off, it was at a table just 8 9 like this where we were hearing in the feed 10 and grain industry that the different avenues that the USDA and the Department of 11 12 Justice were pursuing. 13 And at the table we said, "Well, 14 why don't we create a joint task force". 15 That's where this task force that 16 you've been hearing about today came from 17 was the meeting in Iowa. 18 And I expect today, by listening 19 to you, we'll come up with some additional 20 activities that we need to be doing that 21 could address some of the problems that --

Let me just give you a brief

that you're experiencing.

22

overview. At the Department of Justice, in the Antitrust Division, we essentially have three broad areas of law enforcement that we undertake.

In the Sherman Act enforcement, the Section 1, we generally prosecute criminal cartels, price fixing among companies.

If any of you saw the movie, The Informant, that was an antitrust division criminal prosecution.

Under Section 2 of the Sherman

Act we prosecute large companies that have
a market share in any particular industry
and or abusing that market share in any way
that's predatory or exclusionary.

And then under Section 7 of the Clayton Act we examine mergers. And any merger that may lead to a substantial lessening of competition we're required to block.

At the Department of Agriculture they administer, as the Secretary

1 introduced, the Packers and Stockyard Act.

And the intersection between regulating an industry such as poultry under that act, and the enforcement of the competition laws under the antitrust division is very complex, exceedingly difficult.

And what we have found, at least in the time that we've been here, is that the more we work together the more we understand the industry in its totality.

As you've heard from both the Secretary and the General we understand the poultry industry is very, very vertically integrated. That presents a unique set of challenges when we're looking at competition.

At the same time, the retail side of the industry has become very, very vertically integrated or very consolidated.

In 1992, for example, the top four supermarkets had 17% of grocery sales. Today the top four stores have over 40% of

all sales.

So you've got consolidation on the retail side and you've got vertical integration on the production side. And than can lead to a lot of imbalances in the system.

In a regulated industry where you look to correct those imbalances is a combination of using the tools that antitrust division has in concert with the tools that the USDA has through enforcement of the Packers and Stockyard Act.

So, Secretary, what we're doing is working very closely with your staff to help us -- them educate us on where they need the antitrust enforcement.

We talked about the role that you've been working on. We've been giving you, at the staff level, a lot input into that role to ensure that when it likely undergoes any judicial review, when it becomes final, it's sustainable from our perspective.

As a matter of fact, when the USDA rules are challenged, it is actually the Department of Justice that represents the USDA.

So I think over the years there's been varying degrees of collaboration between the two agencies. I think all of our staff have informed me that there has never been the degree the collaboration that there has -- that there is now.

So from the highest level to all the way through the staff on the ground to the staff here on the ground, you can be sure that whatever is happening at USDA they're involving us.

Whatever we're hearing about, they're the experts, we're going back to them.

Our mission with the USDA is to protect the consumer welfare of the citizens of the United States, whether they be producers or whether they be growers to ensure -- through ensuring that our markets

1 are open and fair and competitive. 2 that's what we're doing. 3 SECRETARY VILSACK: Thank you. 4 We've got a few minutes left. 5 And what I'd like to do is to give the 6 Commissioner and the Congressman an 7 additional question. 8 And then give the General any 9 closing comments for this particular 10 section they'd like to share. Commissioner, let me go back to 11 12 you and simply ask you this question: Ιf 13 we reconvene, say in ten years from now, 14 what would you hope we would be able to say 15 about the poultry industry that would be a 16 little bit different than it is today or 17 how you would see it different? 18 COMMISSIONER SPARKS: Well, it 19 would be -- what I would hope is that we 20 keep our markets open. 21 That we compete in a global 22 world. 23 That we -- that the integrators

and the farmers have a better line of communication of understanding each other's responsibilities and investments.

And I would hope that ten years from now, rather than it being a two billion dollar industry in Alabama, it's a ten billion dollar industry, but I just think there's a lot of opportunities here.

Working with our universities.

Using the technology that's available to allow these -- and reward those technologies and allow these growers to compete in the marketplace under -- under the restraints that they -- that they have to live under.

So I would hope that, and I believe this, is that if we -- if we have that line of communication and break down those barriers that growers understand the companies and companies understand the growers, and that we have that line of communication.

I think that's where the

disconnect is, Mr. Secretary, is that sometimes, even -- even though we're partner shipping, they don't understand each other's responsibilities.

And I think the more we understand that; then the -- then the poultry industry moves forward and we all benefit from it.

SECRETARY VILSACK: Congressman.

CONGRESSMAN DAVIS: One important thing, Mr. Secretary, that I think that you and this Justice Department recognize is an anti-competitive environment is an inefficient environment. And that's worth spending a few seconds serving to folks who don't think about these issues every day.

Sometimes there's a mindset -thunder -- sometimes there's a mindset of
the American economy that if we just get
out of the way, if government is
laissez-faire, if the Justice Department
sits on the sidelines that things will
naturally happen.

And we are comfortable in that
belief, many of us, because we like our
free market system, we like our capitalist

5 and an economic model.

But the reality as Presidents from Teddy Roosevelt to Barack Obama have understood, sometimes we've got to be watchful, sometimes we have to be vigilant. Sometimes we have to make sure that in the name of an open market we don't crowd out competition. And in the name of efficiency we don't do something that's enormously inefficient.

system and we venerate that as both a value

And, Mr. Secretary, you put your finger on it earlier, the American consumer is a very privileged person. The American consumer lives in one of the few highly vibrant societies of the world where most of us have routine access to most consumer items. And most of us have a reasonable opportunity to climb to the next economic lever, even in the midst from the aftermath

of the incredibly deep recession we've had, that's one of the geniuses of the American economy.

If we get this mess the

Commissioner talks about right in the next

ten years, if we get it right in the next

two decades, we'll preserve the consumer's

capacity to have access to the market.

We will preserve the industry's capacity to be productive and efficient in the right kind of way.

And, finally, we will preserve the men and women who are laboring on farms day in and day out, we will preserve your capacity to keep doing what you do because that's what I want to end with.

The number of men and women in this state and this region who had walked away from farming in the last 40 years is aching.

So many people who grew up on farming are walking away from it and it's draining vitality from whole parts of this

1 state. 2 We've got to connect those 3 individuals. We've got to give them the 4 promise that they deserve. And if we do it, it won't simply 5 be good for farmers and agri-business, it 6 7 will help lift up the economy of the entire state and the entire region. 8 9 SECRETARY VILSACK: Thank you 10 very much. 11 You know to the Congressman's 12 point, we've lost over a million farmers in 13 that 40-year period around the country. 14 And not only have we lost 15 farmers, but we've lost a lot of population 16 in our rural communities. 17 And, General, you might be 18 interested to know that one-sixth of

And, General, you might be interested to know that one-sixth of America's population, about 16, 17% of Americans lived in rural America, but 45% of those who serve us in uniform come from those small towns and from rural America.

And as we see a squeeze on the

19

20

21

22

folks in rural America and the economy that 1 2 suffers in rural America, and there are 3 fewer and fewer young people being able to 4 stay in rural America, you have to begin to 5 wonder are they're going to be enough folks 6 to care of all of our military needs and our law enforcement needs, where are these 7 8 folks -- where are these folks going to 9 come from. 10 So, Congressman, you're -- you've 11 got a good point there. 12 General, your closing comments 13 before we close this first session. 14 ATTORNEY GENERAL HOLDER: Yeah. 15 I mean, think that, you know, although we 16 are focusing agriculture generally, the 17 poultry industry specifically here today, 18 we're really talking about something that I 19 think in a lot of ways is more basic than 20 that. 21 And it -- I think that goes to 22 the last two sets of comments we've heard.

The American culture, who we are

as Americans, is really -- you know, if you look historically is really based on our agricultural industry, the agricultural component of what America is about.

The values that we hold as

Americans, I think, were developed on

farms. I'm a city guy. I'm proud to be -
I'm proud to be from New York, don't hold

that against me. But I'm also a person who

knows a little about the history of -- of

this nation.

And I think it's important for us to make sure that we hold on to the values that were developed in our rural areas that continue to sustain this nation and differentiate this nation from, you know, many other nations around the world. It's what makes, you know, this nation great.

What we want to do is come up with a way in which we, in government, can help to make sure that there are efficiencies, that there is fairness there.

And that our economic -- economic

system that we have is consistent with the values that we always espouse.

We're not looking for government to direct things, but government can play a role as a referee at times.

The Obama Administration is not looking, one way or the other way, as much as just to try to make sure that fairness is the thing that permeates the agricultural sector.

And in doing so, I think we will do the greatest service, which is to perhaps reverse the trends that we have heard about people leaving farms, people not being able to pass on to their sons and daughters the ability to do the great things that they have done and the things that have shaped this country, the things that have made this nation great.

Our economy and our well-being is at stake, which is somewhat, I think, you know, the sole of this nation is also something that we are fighting to preserve.

And that's something that you-all, I think, 1 2 are key parts of. 3 And, so, what we want to do, as I 4 said at the beginning, is really to listen 5 to you, to figure out ways in which we can 6 be of service to you. 7 And in doing so make sure that we 8 preserve the great nation that we've always 9 had and that we want to continue to have. 10 SECRETARY VILSACK: General, 11 thank you. 12 We are going to a break for --13 for about 15, 20 minutes or so and try to 14 reconvene here for the next roundtable, 15 which will be the poultry growers.

talk to growers and former producers about their expectations.

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

That will then be followed by a lunch break. And then we will reconvene after lunch for an opportunity for the public generally to provide testimony.

That will be followed by another roundtable discussion of individuals, both

1 in terms of the government, as well as 2 academic and -- and the producer and 3 industry viewpoint. 4 And then additional opportunities 5 for public testimony and closing remarks. So we will break for about 15 or 6 7 20 minutes. (Whereupon, the taking of the 8 9 proceedings were recessed from 10 approximately 10:03 a.m. to 11 approximately 10:41 a.m., after 12 which the following proceedings 13 were had and done:) 14 SECRETARY VILSACK: If I can call 15 everyone's attention to the -- to the next 16 panel. 17 Let me, first of all, introduce 18 the panel. And I can't see the name 19 plates. So I'm not sure -- all right. 20 Gary, I'm going to start with 21 you. I'm just going to go right down the 22 line introducing folks. And then we'll get 23 -- get some questions and answers.

1 These introductions will be 2 short. And if I mispronounce the name, I 3 sincerely apologize. 4 Garry Staples is the present owner and manager of the White Acres Farm 5 6 and Egg House Poultry Operation. Owns 60 7 head of registered cows. He's served as a board member of 8 9 the National Poultry Growers Association as 10 well as vice president of the Alabama 11 Contract Poultry Growers Association. 12 He's on the Board of Directors of 13 the St. Clair County Soil and Water 14 Conversation. 15 He's served as an officer of the 16 St. Cloud -- St. Clair County Cattlemen's 17 Association and the Alabama Cattlemen's 18 Association. 19 He's presently a Major in the 20 Army Reserves. And we thank you for your 21 service. He's served as the past company

commander of the Signal Company, 20th

Special Forces.

22

He was a team leader of the 1 2 Operational Detachment 821 1st Battalion, 3 20th Century -- 20th Special Forces. Carole Morison is next. And she 4 5 is a farmer from Maryland. She and her family raised chickens under contract for 6 7 23 years on their family farm. She helped organize the Del Margo 8 9 Poultry Justice Alliance and served as 10 Executive Director for eight years. 11 Currently she's a private 12 agricultural consultant specializing in 13 local food systems. 14 Gary Alexander is owner and 15 operator of Alexander Farms, Inc., a 16 poultry production and property development business in Westminster, South Carolina. 17 18 He markets 3.2 million broilers a 19 year through his 18 broiler house farm and 20 develops residential properties as well. 21 He serves on the Board of 22 Directors of Excel Farm Credit, ACA and 23 AgFirst Farm Credit Bank, which he serves

1 on the audit committee. 2 Additionally he serves on the 3 Board of Directors of the CS Poultry 4 Federation and the Outdoor Green 5 Foundation, an organization providing outdoor adventures for children with 6 7 life-threatening illnesses. 8 Kay Doby, who is to my immediate left, has made Cameron, North Carolina here 9 10 home for four -- I won't say how many 11 years. 12 MS. DOBY: 55. 13 SECRETARY VILSACK: Okay. 14 years. I was trying to be delicate. 15 She lives on a 3rd generation 16 farm and continues raise meat, pigs and a 17 small flock of chickens. 18 She's taught kindergarten for 15 19 years. 20 She and her husband built two 21 broiler houses and raised poultries until 22 October of 2008 when their contract was 23 terminated.

Robert Lumzy, did I say that 1 2 right, sir? 3 MR. LUMZY: Yes. 4 SECRETARY VILSACK: Mr. Lumzy is 5 currently a heavy equipment operator. April of 1999 he purchased Lumzy Poultry 6 7 Farms where he raised chickens for a living and provided jobs for those in the 8 9 community who were unemployed. 10 In 2006 Robert lost his contract 11 and it's his desire to regain his contract 12 and once again become a business owner. 13 Sandra Pridgen is a seventh generation family farmer from Snow Hill, 14 15 North Carolina. She transitioned the farm 16 from tobacco and contract poultry 17 production to a sustainable grass-based fed 18 marketing meats directly to consumers 19 through farmer's markets, fine clubs and 20 restaurants. 21 Rainbow Meadow Farms currently 22 markets, poultry, eggs, beef, pork, lamb 23 and rabbit locally in North Carolina.

1 And she spent five years -- the 2 last five years conducting on farm research 3 for pasture based livestock systems and 4 poultry genetics appropriate for those 5 systems. 6 And our last panelist on the end 7 is Shane Wooten. Did I pronounce that right? 8 9 MR. WOOTEN: Yes. 10 SECRETARY VILSACK: Shane was 11 raised on a poultry and cattle farm in 12 De Kalb County, Alabama. 13 In 1997 he purchased a farm next 14 to his father's farm and began constructing 15 12 broiler houses where he continues to 16 raise poultry. In 2006 he also become an 17 18 insurance agent for the A-L-F-A Insurance, 19 specializing in poultry farm insurance. 20 Assistant Attorney General 21 Varney. 22 And I thank all members of the 23 panel for their participation.

And what I'd like to do is start off with a question and we'll direct it.

All of the panel is here today and ask you to comment on it.

And just we'll start there with you and just kind of work right down the line.

And, basically, the question is this: The poultry industry over the last 40 years has become consolidated and -- and to a certain extent vertically integrated. And the number of countries -- companies for growers to do business varies from each region of the country.

In your experience, how does that impact and affect the fairness of contracts?

And what options should we consider in taking a look at those circumstances where there may be only one or two companies able to do business, what needs to be done to make sure that farmers and growers get a fair shake?

1 MR. STAPLE: Mr. Secretary, I appreciate y'all coming today. 2 3 But talking about the integrators 4 being in one area. In my county alone, 5 we've got two, but they're up -- they do 6 not cross lines at this time anyway. 7 I wish I had an answer for you to 8 tell you how to fix that problem, but if 9 you could just get fair and -- and 10 competitive markets with these people where we could, as a grower, be able to go to 11 another integrator and say, look, I -- I 12 13 can do this for you and get them to help us 14 with that situation. As it stands right now with the 15 16 contracts that we're offered now it's 17 either a take it or leave it situation. So 18 it really puts us in a bind as growers. 19 MS. MORISON: I'd like to thank 20 you for being here today as well and for 21 giving us this opportunity. 22 As far as the consolidation of

the -- of the industry there use to be

1 seven poultry companies where I'm from. 2 We're down to four now. Two are very small 3 poultry companies, two are major poultry 4 companies. 5 And every year we see things 6 downsizing more and more where, you know, 7 smaller ones are -- are bought up. I don't see much difference in 8 9 contracts between companies. It might be a 10 few different words that are used, but 11 basically they're the same. So, you know, the contracts aren't really affected by 12 13 that as to whether you're big or small. 14 Contracts are basically the same. 15 SECRETARY VILSACK: Gary 16 Alexander. 17 MR. ALEXANDER: Thank you for the 18 opportunity to be here. 19 In our particular area we are 20 afforded three integrators. And when you 21 look at those contracts each one of them 22 are just minor sentences apart of each 23 other, very equitable.

And in research and preparation for this meeting I looked into an area of 14 states served by the AgFirst Farm Credit Bank. And those contracts throughout that 14 states are with -- again, within pennies of each other.

In two or three cases we saw contracts where the grower only had a choice of one integrator were in, some cases, better than the ones where you have multiple choices.

So the contract portion of this business is just like any market driven decisions. It's based upon competition and availability of those services.

MS. DOBY: In our area we have more than one company, but it seems to be a written rule that if you go grow for one company, you really don't have the opportunity to even cross those lines to go to another company. And with -- like what they're saying, the contracts are pretty much the same, but it's -- it's not a

common practice. If you start with one 1 company, you -- you usually stay with them. 2 SECRETARY VILSACK: 3 Robert. 4 MR. LUMZY: Thank you for 5 allowing me this opportunity. But as every one else has said, in our community there 6 7 are several companies, but once you start with one, that's the only one that will 8 9 allow you a contract. They won't cross the 10 lines to come to your farm. 11 MS. PRIDGEN: I -- I would say that I basically agree with Kay of what she 12 13 said. What -- what we've found is that the 14 companies, there's is a slight variation in 15 maybe the type of heating system that they have, that company A uses for their heater 16 17 or their feed line system. 18 And, so, if you end up trying to 19 go to another integrator; then that 20 integrator is going to say, Well, you know, 21 you're going to have to make all these changes to the specific, you know, 22

Cumberland Heating System or a particular,

23

1 you know, feed system that we use. 2 So they use that as an excuse not 3 to take you on. 4 And, also, the other thing is if 5 they do end up taking you on, their preference is always for getting -- if 6 7 they're in expansion mode, their preference has always been given for new houses. 8 9 And as soon as -- what we've 10 found in our experiences, as soon as they 11 can get new houses, they're going to dump 12 those people that -- that -- that they've 13 brought on from another company. 14 MR. WOOTEN: Thank you, Mr. 15 Secretary. 16 In my area we've been very 17 fortunate. At one time we actually had 18 five integrators that served the area where 19 I lived. It's kind of a sweet spot there. 20 So competition has been pretty good in that 21 area. 22 You mentioned vertical 23 integration. And I kind of have some basic 1 thoughts on that.

Vertical integration, I think,
has been key to the poultry industry for
the last 40 years and has provided a stable
income for the poultry farmers in the state
of the market. But as far as competition,
I think we have a pretty good competition
in our area compared to some others.

SECRETARY VILSACK: During the course of our first panel Mr. Staples mentioned concerns that he had about -- about a lack of communication or miscommunication or an inability to communicate between companies and producers.

I'd be curious to know from your own personal experience or from experiences of people that you know and trust, do you share the Commissioner's concerns?

And if so, what suggestions would you make for us as to how we might be able to help improve communication?

And I'm just going to start this

1 way and come down the other way. 2 MR. WOOTEN: Well, communication 3 is -- between the grower and -- and 4 integrator is -- is one thing that I've 5 prepared a statement on. 6 And if you don't mind, I'll go 7 ahead and start with that. 8 SECRETARY VILSACK: Sure. No 9 problem. 10 MR. WOOTEN: A couple of the 11 issues that is facing the contract growers 12 that I would like to discuss is, number 13 one, rapid rise in expenses over the past 14 two years. And, number two, the breakdown in 15 16 communication between contractors and 17 integrators. 18 Just a quick example of expense 19 increase. When my brother and I completed 20 our construction of our houses in 1999 21 expenses have dramatically increased, but 22 although there are many different input 23 expenses that go into a poultry farm,

1 propane costs is -- is one of the largest.

In 1999 our propane cost was about approximately \$42,000 a year.

In 2009 that propane -- that same propane cost had increased to approximately \$92,000 a year.

That was a hundred and twenty percent increase. So that was a bottom line cut off of our profitability. Those increases have dramatically affected profitability for the contract grower.

And, in fact, the integrated system that has provided such a good, stable income for so long, we actually lost money in 2008 on our farm for the first time.

This discrepancy between income and increased expenses is -- including myself and a lot of the other growers as you had mentioned in the earlier panel, we have had to go outside the farm to provide for our families.

I think in the same time frame

comparison, I think the contract paid -for me, contract pay has increased
approximately 17% from 4.7 cents a pound to
5.5 cents per pound, which is nowhere close
to offset the rising costs.

But integrators also have not been immune to these rapid rises in cost and input expenses, but, unlike the contract grower, the integrators do have the ability to reduce production and drive the chicken prices, which helps their profitability. The contractor does not have that opportunity.

In fact, I read in the Poultry

Times magazine this week that integrators

are actually in the -- are poised to

increase production because of some of the

contracts or some of the production

cutbacks that they have made, the article

stated that poultry prices were at a level

to where good profits could be made.

Unfortunately, integrators do not the realize that the need that continues to

-- continues to drive those prices up in
order to be able to increase contract pay.

I think it's the inability of the integrators to understand the financial strain that is placed on contract growers at this time.

I believe that is key. The key reason for that is a communications breakdown inside the companies and also from grower to integrator.

That communication breakdown -- as we all know communication is very important in every business.

I was raised on a poultry farm.

And one of the biggest changes that has occurred, that -- that I feel has affected communications over the last 20 years is that 20 years ago almost every employee in our area, almost every employee of the integrator in the grow out side from the service technician all the way up to complex manager were actually contract growers themselves.

So that close relationship
between the company and the contract
growers was -- gave a better representation
of the contract growers in any company
decisions that were made.

In comparison, over the last few years, a number -- that number has steadily declined. And some integrators have actually banned their employees from having -- from being contract growers.

In effect that -- in effect the contract grower has lost their representation inside the companies or inside the integrators.

That has, in turn, led -- led to uninformed decisions by the companies themselves that has affected the contract grower adversely.

This communications breakdown inside of these companies themselves has become more evident in the past few years as profit margins for the companies have tightened and they've also tightened for

the growers.

So the constant pressure that these tightening of margins that is placed on employees to keep cost at a minimal has caused some employees to be reluctant to bring up issues that may have concerned the contractor grower because it would be an extra, additional cost to that company.

So I do not believe that is a result of the company's employees' negligence, I just simply believe that this is just a result of the high input expenses and the low profit margins over the last few years and just the general corporate structure and how communications travels up the structure.

SECRETARY VILSACK: Thank you.

Sandra -- and feel free -- I know that folks have prepared, in some cases, written statements. If you'd like to read them, that's fine, or summarize them, that's fine, in response to this particular question or if you just simply want to

1 furnish them.

We are making a record, a transcript of this, and it will be incorporated into the record.

Question about communication.

MS. PRIDGEN: As you know, we are independent poultry producers now. But what I'd like to say is that when we were contract producers some of the things that we noticed as a lack of communication was what they term as new grower's contract. Where you initially start out with an initial contract.

And then in a few years they bring in a new grower's contract and you have to sign it before you can receive your next flock.

And there's been no negotiation and no communication between the grower or a group growers for that company and negotiation of that contract with the integrator. So you either sign it or you don't receive your next flock.

And when you have that kind of

debt load over you, of course, you're going

to choose to sign the contract. You feel

that there's no other option when you owe,

you know, a half a million dollars or a

6 million dollars.

Also there's -- there's a lack of communication in that what is said in the contract and what is verbally communicated or verbally implied is oftentimes two different things, you know.

My dad was -- after -- after the first company shut down our complex, my dad was taken on by another company called Kay's Farms. And with that -- in order to be taken on he took on a \$80,000 debt to make equipment renovations on -- on 16-year old poultry houses so that he could grow for that company.

And the company, as soon as they could get brand new houses built with tobacco allotment, buyout money that farmers were getting, they dropped those

former Perdue farmers and were -- and they 1 2 were left debt. 3 My dad, was one of them, was left with, you know, an \$80,000 debt. He grew 4 5 12 flock for them and they dumped him. Thank you, sir. 6 MR. LUMZY: 7 I'm sitting here listening to no 8 communication. Our problem is that when we 9 have a problem with the company you have a 10 service person comes out, they tell you 11 what the company says. They tell you, with 12 me now back in -- when I lost my farm. 13 They came out, we worked together 14 and got my farm straight. And I asked a 15 question, I said, "Will it cause me to lose my contract"? 16 17 And they said -- what I -- that 18 the deficiency that I had would not cause 19 me to terminate my contract that afternoon. 20 At six o'clock -- at 6:00 p.m. I 21 got a phone call from Sanderson Farms 22 saying my contract was terminated. And I'm

going -- I didn't get a chance to talk to

23

1 them. I didn't get a chance to tell them 2 what happened. 3 So I probably knew, not the right amount of communication. 4 5 MS. DOBY: Well, this is kind of 6 in response to Robert said. That's one of 7 the ugly realities of the growers talking about communications. 8 Communications. Growers that are 9 10 here today are in jeopardy because of 11 intimidation by company personnel. And 12 they're taking a big risk. Everybody --13 every grower here is taking a big risk. 14 And -- and you ask them, they'll tell you. 15 Communication. I had a grower 16 tell me two weeks ago he was talking to the 17 service person that -- and his question involved the chicks that that he had just 18 19 gotten. 20 And the service person, the 21 answer he got was, "You know, you should 22 just be glad you've got a job". 23 Well, the grower got the message

1 real quick because in North Carolina, right 2 there in his neighborhood, there are a 3 hundred and sixty poultry houses sitting 4 empty and growers have no way to pay those 5 payments. 6 MR. ALEXANDER: I've got some 7 prepared comments, but I think you can --8 SECRETARY VILSACK: We can't hear 9 Do you want to speak into the you. 10 microphone. 11 MR. ALEXANDER: I've got a 12 prepared comment. 13 But I think you can reflect up 14 the communication, as the earlier gentleman 15 stated, that this is a partnership. 16 it's a partnership between, oftentimes an 17 individual and a corporation, but the thing 18 that drives it is the communication. 19 And from my prepared comments I 20 think it will address my feelings. 21 Integrators provided a minimum 22 risk and total market dynamic protection 23 for many individuals engaging in poultry

1 production.

Nowhere can anyone go into business totally insulated from market risk and consumer preference changes.

Without integrators growers could

-- could not afford to be in the chicken

business because of the cash flow demands

and the market swings at their own farm

level.

Growers realize that the integrators have a lot of risk, capital, fixed assets, operational cash and et cetera, but the real success of an integrator depends upon their ability to get growers to participate with them to achieve a common goal.

In most cases a vertically integrated operation has total assets at risk, much less than the collective dollars at risk by all growers as a single group.

Poultry grow out is a great opportunity for young and beginning farmers through USDA with several levels of

guarantees, low equity levels, integrator 1 2 assisted cash flow, opportunities that normal businesses do not have access to. 3 4 The young farmer with access to 5 land can complete a poultry house, can be 6 in a positive cash flow position in as little as 16 weeks. 7 8 A poultry house well maintained 9 has a life of over 30 years. 10 Most contracts will pay the 11 grower for his time, provide manure sales, 12 pay off debt in a 12 to 15 years. 13 If a grower has all farm income, 14 there's great tax benefits available during 15 this amortization period. 16 A well-managed poultry operation 17 can be a cash cow for 20 years. 18 Oftentimes upgrades are 19 This allows the grower to make necessary. 20 a minimum, additional investment, again, to enjoy a favorable tax benefit, the tax 21 22 consideration and complete utilization of

23

depreciation.

1 Current grow out contracts in our 2 area with the integrators who serve us 3 provide about a 20% return on investment. Historically, prior to the latest 4 5 economic challenges, poultry production, as 6 a percentage of assets held by a bank, only 7 2% of the poultry loans have wound up in 8 non-accrual. 9 Chicken houses come with a lot of 10 USDA assistance. 11 You hear a lot about row crop 12 disaster, but we have disaster programs in 13 chicken houses. 14 We have energy upgrade grants. 15 We have grants for manure holding 16 facilities and dead bird composters. 17 Poultry growers make a commitment 18 to treat the chicken house like a small 19 manufacturing facility are successful, not 20 like something that can be done at the end 21 of the day. 22 The grower must understand the 23

grow out rules, lighting programs, feed

schedules are a result of large volumes of data being analyzed to best fit the grow out cycle.

Each grower is provided daily the very best grow out conditions for a particular breed to perform.

The quality of a grower, in most cases, is reflected by his performance, but every grower is subject to get weak birds or just a bad performance over a given period of time.

The competitive contract formula is the hard -- is the best way to reward the hardest workers for the greatest amount of return.

These contracts selling like birds, with like diets, with like weather conditions for a fixed period are very equitable.

Fixed contracts with an off farm owner would not be healthy, nor contribute to the ultimate product competitiveness in the marketplace.

Growers must be held accountable for performance through competition.

Integrator requirements for upgrades of current housing standards is sometimes, not always has to be. A house built in a current cycle has a state of art, equipment and facilities. These new facilities will out perform the technology and equipment of aging facilities.

In our area growers are often allowed to upgrade to stay at the current pay level or they're offered a contract at a lesser level continuing to do business as usual. Again, another example of risk equals rewards.

Historically the -- sometimes what we see in our areas is the terminated growers refuses to see that he needs to be more efficient. And that reflects in the communications we were talking about.

Reward is a function of risk and effort.

When you look at a big picture the grower starts out with the fewest birds

1 or extended out times is a small price to 2 pay for the total success of the long-term 3 operation. 4 I appreciate the fact that I've never had to write a check to make an 5 6 integrator whole base upon market 7 conditions. 8 The current oversight provided by 9 GIPSA serves the industry well. There's no 10 need for more government intervention in 11 the poultry industry. 12 A brief look at the packers and 13 stockers complaints show a minimum amount 14 of intervention necessary to maintain fair 15 and equitable standards. 16 If you look at GIPSA --17 SECRETARY VILSACK: Folks, let's 18 -- let's -- let's make sure that everyone 19 gets a chance to have their say in a 20 respectful way. 21 MR. ALEXANDER: The limited 22 antitrust immunity provided by Capper

Volstead and other favorable statutes

23

1 enable growers and integrators to join 2 together collectively in the process to 3 market their because the buyer power in the 4 agricultural marketplace is strong -- was 5 stronger than it was in 1922 when Capper 6 Volsted was enacted. The acts protection 7 continues to be critically important to the nation's environment. 8 9 I strongly believe any action to 10 eliminate or delete the Capper Volsted or 11 similar political statute would harm the 12 success and efficiencies of rural 13 communities. 14 MS. MORISON: Would you like me 15 just to answer your question or --16 SECRETARY VILSACK: 17 MS. MORISON: Can you repeat the 18 question? 19 SECRETARY VILSACK: Sure. It has 20 to do with communications, whether or not 21 -- the Commissioner suggested that there --22 there was a need for better communication. 23 And if you want to incorporate

whatever statements you to like, feel free to do that. I'm going to give you an opportunity to have that.

MS. MORISON: I think that -- I

think first off the communication idea,
there probably is a great lack of
communication. I'd say it's a one-sided
communication. The grower listens and the
company tells you what to do. That's been
my experience.

And, you know, it's -- for -- for instance, you know, we've had mention of demanded upgrades of poultry houses, you know. The company will come out say, "You have to do this, this and this or you get no more chickens in whatever contract you're in".

That's no way to communicate with anybody, number one. It's going to make the person mad.

Secondly, specifically, after 23 years of raising chickens, our contract was terminated because we refused to do

demanded upgrades.

And, you know, a few weeks before
-- prior to receiving the termination
letter for our contract, we were given an
outstanding producer award by the very
company that was terminating our contract.

So I don't think that communication works. I mean, there was no communication there. We were putting out a good product. It was just said you do it or get no chicklets.

I -- I really think

communications have been tried and have

failed. I've been at this for a while.

I've seen a lot of efforts to make

communications work. And I can honestly

say I have not seen anything change since

the earlier 1990's within the industry

trying to use communications between

growers and the poultry companies.

Secondly, I'd -- I'd -- I'd like to add in, you know, the ranking system, which should be maybe a form of

communication, but, you know, the ranking
system is -- is how growers are paid.

And the inputs to the farm versus the output of pounds of meat moved off the farm kind of sums up really easily to explain how this ranking system works; however, all of the inputs are direct poultry company product that are placed on the grower's farm on a good faith basis.

The grower must trust the company to deliver them quality inputs for their farm to be competitive, to raise a marketable product, and for them to have the best potential of farm income.

The ranking system in no way reflects a grower's performance. It's a reflection of the quality of company inputs in producing the output of pounds of meat.

Company control over the inputs besides flock performance and farm income. This control can lead to hampering or enhancing the farm's access to fair and free trade.

Someone earlier, you know,

mentioned about company employees having

poultry farms, you know.

It's been said many, many times

by growers that, you know, the company

by growers that, you know, the company employees who are running poultry farms get the best inputs put on their farms. Since they're the ones that are influencing and controlling where these inputs go, they decide who gets what.

So, you know, some companies have banned employees from having contracts on their farms. Other companies have it.

Obviously, if some companies have banned this practice, then there must be some good reason for it.

I think the bottom line is that, you know, unless every farm placed in a week's ranking receives the exact same and identical inputs, the ranking system is unfair.

We can go all the way back to chick quality that's delivered to farms,

1 breeds that perform differently.

Growers aren't consulted on, you know, the breeds or genetics or, you know, which one performs better. And, well, now, I don't want them, I'd rather have this batch over here, we have to take what the company brings us.

And then we're suppose to, you know, perform our contractual duty of raising the best flock possible.

There's a lot of deciding factors before the chicks are ever delivered to the farm, you know, the genetics, the health, the age and care of the breeder flock.

That decides how well the chicks perform.

It has nothing do with the grower, it's a company input. They're the ones that control this.

Transportation of eggs, you know, from breeder farms to company hatcheries varies as well as the operations at the company owned hatcheries before they're -- you know, the chicks are hatched out to

1 come to the farm.

Feed is another issue. It's the most costly input for raising a flock of chickens. And is the foremost influence on a grower's ranking.

Feed is formulated, mixed, loaded and weighed by the company and then delivered to the farm. Feed must be accepted by the grower on the company's say so. And there's no guarantee that the feed is of the highest quality or quantity.

Personally, you know, we've had several issues of -- of feed quality and quantity coming to the farm.

Number one, feed quality, I mean we've had feed so bad delivered to the farm that it actually froze in the feed bin. We had to have someone come in and take the feed bin apart, chop the frozen feed out, repair the equipment, put new feed back in. And that had nothing to do with our -- our performance, that was determined by the company. So, again, there was no

1 communication there.

Well, you know, what we really delivered you some really bad feed. So let's see if we can't fix this and work it out. And, you know, really, you shouldn't be penalized for something that was our mistake.

Instead the communication that comes across is, we didn't do anything wrong, it's on you, and that's the way it goes.

You know, quantities of feed being delivered to the farm. There's no way to verify how much feed actually comes. It's -- again, as I said, weighed on company scales.

We get a -- a weight ticket and we have to accept it because the company says so.

Personally, we were going to put scales on our farm to verify weights and feed that were being delivered by the company.

1 First we were informed by the 2 company that if we were to put scales on 3 the farm that there was no law that said 4 they had to go across their scales because 5 they owned the check-ins. 6 Then we were told point blank, "Well, if you do it we're going to 7 8 terminate your contract". Now, I see nothing wrong with a 9 10 grower wanting to put a set of scales on 11 their farm. It helps them be a better 12 manager to control what is coming on to the 13 farm and what is going off of the farm, you 14 know. 15 Why would a company have a 16 problem with you putting scales on the 17 farm. 18 Again, this was -- you know, 19 there was no communication about this, 20 there was no discussion. "It's if you do, 21 your contract is terminated". Personally, I -- I can't count 22 23 the many, many times that I have heard in

one shape or form or another that our 1 2 contract was going to be terminated if we did such and such. That's no way to 3 4 communicate with people who are your 5 business partners. And I think probably the last, 6 7 you know, thing that -- that I'd like to address here is -- is the confusions and 8 9 the frustrations, you know, of how a grower 10 can find help under the Packers and 11 Stockyards Act because I know it doesn't --12 maybe it does have to do with 13 communication, but just in a different form 14 between growers and government agencies. 15 And, you know, it's -- it's 16 common knowledge that, you know, GIPSA only has certain authorities. They can only 17 18 investigate complaints. 19 If there's any violations found, 20 you know, it has to be referred to the 21 Department of Justice. 22 And, you know, it's

understandable to me, although frustrating,

23

that the Department of Justice has, you
know, a lot more important issues to
address than the issues of one contract
poultry farmer. I mean, you know, we do
have bad guys out there in the country and
around the world.

So, you know, that right there then is understood, but then it needs to be understood, too, that once a grower does file a complaint with GIPSA, they're left wide open for retaliation by the company they contract with. And it's the single most important fact that keeps growers from filing complaints.

Companies are also aware of the inability of enforcement of the act. And GIPSA investigations, I mean, I've -- I've heard comments from company personnel that it's nothing more than a hassle in their daily operations because they know that there will be no enforcement of the act because GIPSA does not have that authority.

So, I think, probably, what needs

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

to be done there, either USDA needs to have the same authority and powers over poultry as they do over other livestock, or a clear and concise method needs to be developed in which communications are opened in which easily flow between USDA, GIPSA and the Department of Justice in order that growers do have an open avenue for making complaints.

And, you know, for knowing that this information went to all the proper places it should have gone and help can be given. Thank you.

> SECRETARY VILSACK: Garry.

MR. STAPLES: Secretary Vilsack, I'd like to comment on this communications thing, first, and then read a statement -regardless of what some of the press releases say was prepared by me and not by somebody else. It may not be as good as it could have been by somebody else.

But as far as communication wise, when I first started we had a yearly

meeting with my integrator. Went on for 1 about two years. 2 But since that time I've -- even 3 4 with that integrator and a new one, the 5 only communication I have is with my 6 service tech, unless I ask to speak to 7 someone. 8 And if I get the opportunity to 9 do that, it's one-on-one, me and whoever I 10 ask and my service tech. So the 11 communication problem is a problem, I 12 really feel it is. 13 What y'all can do for us, I don't 14 really -- I don't really know, but it is a 15 problem. 16 And if you don't mind, I'll --17 I'll read my statement. 18 I'm here today to speak to you 19 about my experiences as a poultry grower as 20 well as those of other poultry growers. 21 I'm not here just for myself. 22 I've been in the business for 23 nine years. At that time I had a 7-year

1 contract. Four years ago I changed 2 integrators and I was given a 3-year 3 contract. Last year I signed a new contract, flock-to-flock. 4 5 What that means is every 60 days that's the only time I'm actually under 6 7 contract to grow chickens. At the end of that 60 days, I can be terminated. 8 9 I've personally borrowed a 10 million and a half dollars. And everything 11 I've got is mortgaged so I can be a poultry 12 grower. 13 I've got eight poultry houses, 14 two dwelling houses, a hundred and eighty 15 acres of land and all the life insurance 16 policies I've got. 17 As a poultry grower with 18 everything I've been mortgaged, I had no 19 choice but to sign that flock-to-flock 20 contract. Like many of them of said, 21 either I sign it or I ain't got no

Without any chickens, I can't pay

22

chickens.

1 any bills. I can't pay my mortgage because 2 chicken houses are designed for one thing, 3 grow chickens. I personally feel like I have a 4 5 good relationship with my integrator. I 6 work for hard them to raise a good, quality 7 chicken, but I wonder how I can feel really secure knowing that every eight to nine 8 9 weeks I may not have a relationship at all 10 with them. 11 Poultry -- poultry business has 12 grown under the contracts for over 50 13 years. The company owns the chickens. 14 They control the quality of the 15 chickens. They control the feed and they 16 17 control the feed weighing system. 18 They control the pay system. 19 And they -- and they can cancel 20 my contract at any time. 21 They also can require expensive 22 upgrades. These upgrades usually cost a 23 substantial amount of money, which means

I've got to take out another loan.

And when I do that I'm not necessarily reimbursed for it by the company in any way.

There's three growers in my county that were given a letter -- a letter on a Thursday that told them they had to make upgrades. The following Monday they got another letter. It said, "You're no longer an employee -- you're no longer a grower with this company".

When this could not be done, the company terminated contracts. And since there's not another company in our area at that time, they were left without chickens and a mortgage that they could not pay.

New houses built in our area of Alabama are given -- at this time some of the areas given near 10-year contracts with a pay system that, according to the contract, will not let make less than zero six point zero six cents per pound regardless of their performance.

My newest two houses are two year

old and equipped the same as these new

houses. My contract is flock-to-flock, not

ten years. My bottom pay is point zero

four three oh.

I've also know growers in our

I've also know growers in our county that their bottom pay is a point zero three two five.

With a flock -- flock-to-flock contract the contract can be changed at any time. With the cost of power, water and gas going higher every year you would think the company would help compensate for more energy costs.

My gas alone has gone from 70 cents to a dollar and twenty-eight in the past six years, just the gas.

Last year I signed a new contract. And instead of helping with my energy allowance, they took away point zero zero three oh cents per pound over a year's grow out.

On my farm alone, just my farm,

that's a \$4500 savings to the company and a 1 2 loss to my farm. 3 And although I came here on my 4 own today, it's not without a lot of worry 5 when I leave that I'll have some retaliation. 6 7 I spent 20 years in the military. 8 And I feel strong about the United States 9 that we should be able to. 10 I appreciate y'all -- y'all for 11 coming and I hope y'all will help us. 12 Thank you. 13 SECRETARY VILSACK: I'm curious 14 to -- to talk to several of you in terms of 15 your experience with the ranking system, 16 which Carole mentioned. 17 And let me start with you, Gary 18 Alexander. 19 Are you operating under the same 20 system and --21 MR. ALEXANDER: We operate under 22 the same system. We're fortunate enough 23 our integrator separates and breeds the

birds, and separates at times of grow out.
And these breed of birds comes with a
different diet and we sell like kind to
like kind each week.
SECRETARY VILSACK: So you're not
experiencing what Sandra was talking about?
MR. ALEXANDER: It results in a
ranking system, but that ranking is based
upon your performance with a given set of
conditions. And everybody you're ranked
with has equal conditions.
SECRETARY VILSACK: Is that the
experience that
UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Who do you
grow for?
MR. ALEXANDER: I I grow
Fieldale Farms. It's a small family
operation in Northeast Georgia.
UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: There's
the difference, there's the difference.
SECRETARY VILSACK: Garry.
MR. STAPLES: In my instance, I
grow what we call or what the industry

calls a big bird. And I may be a little 1 2 bit different from some of the other 3 growers up here. I know they -- most of 4 them in my county grow for another company 5 and they settle with 15 to 20 to sometimes 6 30 growers. 7 In my instance, I settled with --I think the most I've ever settled with is 8 five. 9 10 So this ranking system doesn't 11 hurt me as bad. And there, again, I'm here 12 to work for all growers, not just myself. 13 I still stand to lose money under 14 the ranking system. The ranking system has 15 good points, but it has a lot more bad 16 points than it does good points. 17 SECRETARY VILSACK: The folks on 18 this side. Experience with the ranking 19 system. 20 MR. WOOTEN: I think the -- my 21 experience with the ranking system has not 22 been as nearly as good as some of them and

not nearly as bad as others I think.

The ranking is -- I think was put into place to push performance. And if you -- the way it was designed, if you were --if you done a good job; then you would get rewarded. If you done a better job, if you put more effort into your grow out; then you would get rewarded for that. Of course, it's got it's good and bad aspects. But, overall, I really don't know

But, overall, I really don't know how the proper way to fix that would be besides maybe making sure all of the playing field is level like the -- Garry, I believe it was, mentioned.

MS. PRIDGEN: I don't have a comment.

MS. DOBY: Well, one thing about the ranking system, there's no transparency with a checks and balances to prevent this ranking system from being used to target or to retaliate against the growers.

And one of the things about this ranking system that when it comes into -- one of the things that come into play is

the company says that some of the growers, when they're cut off, they're bad growers.

Well, this ranking system, you're not started out equal.

And the system is controlled by the company.

I think it's unfair because of the lack of transparency gives the company the ability to terminate or penalize growers based on false claims of poor performance that, in fact, is out of the grower's control.

I understand why the company finds this system attractive, but there's one thing that I don't understand is why our federal government allows this to continue. And I really believe that it's an unfair system.

SECRETARY VILSACK: Another comment that's been, you know, in a couple of presentations has to do with the issue of debt and the leverage that debt either does or doesn't provide in a relationship.

And I'd be curious to -- to have the panels' views on whether or not the issue of debt creates an impetus to -- to accept things that you would otherwise not be willing to accept but for the fact that you're concerned about having a business and a debt and the ability to repay the debt.

Is that a serious issue for growers?

MR. WOOTEN: I think definitely

-- definitely that is an issue because of

the extreme debt load -- you know, any -
anybody under that kind of a debt and

realizing that there's no other way besides

poultry -- being in the poultry industry

that you could actually pay off that debt.

It does definitely put a strain on -- on

any -- to accept conditions given by

integrators.

I've been very fortunate that my integrator in our area and all the employees in our complex -- I grow for

Tyson Foods out -- out of the Snead area.

And all the employees have been very easy to work with, but -- and done a good job.

But they do not understand the pressures put on us as a lot of them do not understand the pressures put on us.

MS. PRIDGEN: I would have to say that it puts you in a position to where you don't see another way out of it.

I mean, in our case the farm has been in our family, you know, for over 250 years and what are you going to do, you're going to do, you're going to do what they tell you to do because you can't afford -- you've got the farm put up, you've got the grandparents home place, everything put up, you can't afford to risk all of that.

MR. LUMZY: I agree 100% with what was just said. In fact, when I received my contract, in order for me to receive my first birds, I had to first invest over \$10,000 in upgrades before they

1 would even bring me chickens.

MS. DOBY: Yes. I'd like to read a comment about something that I already had in my statement.

When I retired from teaching in 1993 was considering building two 500 foot chicken houses. I was promised this long-term relationship as long as I raised a good bird, followed the company's instructions.

And, initially, I was provided with a contract for that 10-year length of the loan; however, a few years later the company brought out another version of this contract. Said I needed to sign it to continue to get chickens.

Before the end of the initial 10-year term the company again changed that contract to a 1-year term. I realized that the company could change contracts easily by threatening to stop placing birds if I refused to sign them.

Well, it's typical for growers to

1 be asked to do expensive upgrades on their 2 poultry houses before this first loan and 3 the building has been paid off. I know 4 because I was one of those growers. 5 The threats put before you, the 6 communication, the threat is put before 7 you, if you do not do this, they're not 8 going to bring you any more chickens to 9 grow out. This is extortion, plain and 10 simple. 11 So the growers grow out -- go out 12 to their lenders and they tell them, "Okay, 13 the company wants me to put in new 14 equipment". 15 The lender says, "Sure. How much 16 you need, we'll fix you right up". 17 The grower is now in deeper debt 18 and has to put up more collateral, most of 19 the time his own personal home. 20 The company tells the grower if 21 they make these upgrades that they're --

they're going to get paid more under this

ranking system.

22

1 I asked the company managers, I 2 went to them, I said, "You want me to do 3 this. Show me on paper where I'm going to 4 make this money back to justify borrowing 5 more money when I still owe money on these 6 houses"? 7 They couldn't do it. 8 Growers that have made these mandatory upgrades are now finding 9 10 themselves in financial trouble. 11 Some of them have gotten off 12 farms jobs. 13 Some are refinancing these loans 14 in order to make the payments. 15 10, 15-year poultry loans are 16 turning into 30-year loans with no more 17 than a flock-to-flock quarantee. 18 When companies get into trouble 19 financially they need to cut production and 20 the growers suffer. 21 In North Carolina there are 22 growers that have borrowed a lot of money 23 to make upgrades demanded by the company.

1 And then the company, because of 2 bad financial decisions, terminated their 3 contract. Depending on how many houses the 4 5 grower had the debt can be thousands or even millions of dollars. 6 7 Precious farm land and homes were 8 put up to do what the company demanded. 9 This is where this unfair ranking system 10 comes into play again. 11 The company said that these --12 some of these growers were cut off because 13 they were bad growers. 14 How did they get labeled a bad 15 grower. They got labeled a bad grower by 16 the ranking system. They had no control 17 over the inputs, but then they were labeled 18 by this. 19 This past Monday morning in North 20

Carolina one of these bad growers went out, drove down a country road. He was terminated from his contract, about to lose his home. Took a gun and ended his life.

21

22

1 That's what we're talking about 2 here today. This is personal. It gets 3 real poultry growers. 4 And what we're asking today is 5 the USDA and the Department of Justice to 6 help these contract poultry growers. 7 SECRETARY VILSACK: Carole, what 8 about debt and the leverage that it covers? 9 MR. ALEXANDER: In my --10 SECRETARY VILSACK: No --11 MR. ALEXANDER: -- in our particular area we're very fortunate 12 13 because of the relationship between USDA 14 and the banks. 80% of the loans in -- in 15 the counties that I'm in and the counties 16 that surround me are guaranteed by USDA 17 loans. 18 Throughout that guaranteed 19 process USDA has reviewed that poultry 20 contract and has reviewed the terms of the 21 of the loan and said, "Yes, these two are 22 equal. There's enough cash low to make the

23

payment".

1 You know, I don't know that much 2 about the USDA rules, but it looks like 3 what would be in one place for one state 4 would be for all. 5 But the USDA looks over these contracts and help balances the grower's 6 7 cash flow or has impact upon the grower's cash flow from the very beginning that 8 makes the amortization of these loans fit 9 10 the terms of the contract. 11 SECRETARY VILSACK: It's myriads 12 of reliance on the guarantees that the USDA 13 provides? 14 MR. ALEXANDER: It is. And it's 15 faith that you can put in the fact that 16 obviously USDA knows more about it than you 17 do. So you have a feeling that it will 18 work. 19 SECRETARY VILSACK: So if 20 understand your comment correctly, you're 21 suggesting that there's not as much

leverage as some of these other folks have

experienced because of that?

22

1 MR. ALEXANDER: That's exactly 2 right. SECRETARY VILSACK: Carole. 3 MS. MORISON: I -- I think that 4 5 debt has a major influence over what a 6 grower does, what a grower doesn't do, what 7 they say, what they don't say, what's 8 popular and what's not popular. 9 I don't know about the USDA 10 I don't know. I'm just wondering 11 if we all should be after you-all for giving us bad advice. 12 13 Along those same MR. STAPLES: 14 lines. If it's such a good contract, why 15 does it have to be guaranteed? 16 If -- you know, I -- I got my 17 mine and it's not quaranteed, and I put 18 some money it. But my bank done mine 19 because of my personal wealth or my equity 20 that I'm putting in there. 21 So what I'm saying is, if these 22 contracts are as good as these people say 23 they are, why do they have to be

guaranteed? 1 2 SECRETARY VILSACK: Since we're 3 kind of piling on USDA here --4 ASSISTANT ATTORNEY GENERAL 5 VARNEY: And the DOJ. SECRETARY VILSACK: Well, let me 6 7 just ask this one question and then I will 8 turn to you. Christine, I'm sorry, I'm 9 probably monopolizing this. 10 But I am obviously interested in the -- in the discussion that was started 11 12 between GIPSA and DOJ when -- when there 13 are problems and folks feel the necessity 14 of going to the next step of filing a 15 complaint. 16 And I'm interested in -- in the 17 reaction of everyone -- and, Carole, you 18 brought this up, that everyone else's 19 reaction about, what would be -- how do you 20 solve that problem? 21 Do you perceive it as a problem? 22 And if so, how do you solve it? 23 Do you give -- would you be

1 interested in GIPSA having more enforcement authority as -- as was possibly suggested, 2 3 or do you think that there is a process of 4 improving the current system so it works 5 better? 6 Garry? 7 MR. STAPLES: I personally -- I 8 personally think that GIPSA needs a little 9 more authority. I don't want to take 10 anything away from DOJ because I'm pretty 11 sure they've got their plate pretty full. 12 As I understand it right now, or 13 the people I know in this, especially the 14 one you introduced and put him on the spot, 15 he's a pretty a good man, I think, Mr. 16 I think there's been a tremendous 17 turnaround since he's been there as far as 18 somebody wanting to help us in the poultry 19 industry. 20 In past from, what I knew of 21 GIPSA, poultry was about as low down on the

I think you're going in the right

list as you could get.

1 direction with having full enforcement from 2 GIPSA for poultry, beef, you know, the 3 whole -- the whole meat industry. 4 SECRETARY VILSACK: Gary, your 5 thoughts on that. 6 Do you have anything? 7 MR. ALEXANDER: I'm not very 8 familiar with the enforcement authority of 9 GIPSA. But I had always -- always looked 10 at GIPSA as being, for a lack of better 11 terms, the DOT of the poultry industry. 12 I felt like the integrators had a 13 tremendous amount of respect for when --14 when GIPSA was brought up. And -- and how 15 it functions today, and the fact that we've 16 got more credible people in GIPSA looking 17 at the rules, I think it's a positive 18 thing, but I'm not familiar with the 19 enforcement branch. 20 SECRETARY VILSACK: Thoughts on 21 this subject on this side. Kay. I'm 22 sorry. 23 MS. DOBY: When I was thinking

about this I had came up with three suggestions.

And, one, would be to prohibit that use of that unfair ranking system.

There are other ways that companies could pay growers that create incentives for growers to do a good job without unfairness of that ranking system.

Another one would be make it unlawful for companies to force these growers these expensive upgrades in their poultry houses at their own expenses.

Upkeep is one thing, but if the companies are convinced that these expensive upgrades will improve their bottom line, then maybe that's something they should be paying for. They might be a little bit more cautious about what they are requiring.

And then the third thing was to work together to enforce the Packers and Stockyards Act. And to investigate why the poultry market is so broken that growers

1 pay -- like Shane said, had -- you know, he 2 lost money last year, but it's been 3 basically flat for the past 15 years. 4 SECRETARY VILSACK: So do you 5 thing that -- that GIPSA should have more 6 enforcement authority, or do you think 7 there should be some kind of improvement to 8 the current system so the Department of Justice could act? 9 10 MS. DOBY: Well, I think there's 11 some rules there that have not, you know, 12 being enforced. But, yeah, I think GISPA 13 needs more enforcement authority. 14 MS. PRIDGEN: I think they need 15 more authority. 16 My biggest concern is that 17 there's really no open market for poultry 18 except in my situation, which I'd like to 19 read my prepared statement in a few minutes 20 about, you know, what we're doing and where we're direct marketing. 21 22 But, you know, you can still go 23 to the stockyards and you can still sell

cattle and you can still sell -- you know, it might not be much of a market, but you can sell a little bit of pigs, but there's no -- there's no open market at all for poultry.

There's no options for those growers who have those houses who choose to go grow out from under contract except to grown on -- on a -- on a small scale and start working, building their own entrepreneurial business and doing direct marketing.

And then you get hit with, what I'd like to talk about, which is the lack of opportunities as far as slaughtering.

SECRETARY VILSACK: Well, why don't you just briefly touch on that.

MS. PRIDGEN: As you-all know we had 16 years that we raised under contract, my family did. And at the end of that time my dad was left with \$80,000 debt that had to be paid off. So there we were with the farm. Well, we didn't want to lose farm.

1 So we had to start treading water.

Well, I -- we were raising lamb.

And I had been selling the meat at the local farmer's market and I had developed a core group of customers.

I encouraged dad to start chickens and sell them at the farmer's market. This couldn't pay off the huge debt that he had incurred, but it was better than nothing.

Soon we were getting requests from restaurants, fine clubs and several small co-op grocery stores. Demand was growing, but the new problem was the lack of slaughter infrastructure.

The nearest independent slaughter house was a hundred and thirty-five miles away. We would have to drive 270 -- 270 miles round trip twice a week to process and pick up our birds. And then the owner decided to sell his property to a developer.

So now we would have to take our

birds to either Peachtree, South Carolina,
we -- I live in North Carolina. So we'd
either have to take them to either
Peachtree, South Carolina or Mainta,
Virginia, an average of 426 miles round
trip twice a week to be processed.

It's worthwhile to note that all the while there were three chicken slaughter plants and two turkey slaughter plants within one hour of my farm all owned by poultry corporations.

With diesel fuel at over \$4 a gallon we were losing money and couldn't continue to drive that distance.

Processing birds on farm under

USDA exemption was not a viable option as

USDA has a 20,000 bird exemption under

PO90-492, but the North Carolina Department

of Agriculture only allows a thousand birds

-- chickens to be slaughtered out from

under inspection.

It was apparent that we were going to have to stop raising chickens even

though there was a growing weekly demand.

By then we were marketing about a thousand birds per week.

In late 2007 Chaudhry Halal Meats in Siler City, North Carolina opened a poultry processing plant. Even though this plant is a hundred and fifty miles from our farms, it afforded us the opportunity to continue raising chickens and met the growing demand.

The biggest issue for independent poultry producers is the lack of local slaughter infrastructure.

Vertical integration in the poultry industry over the last 50 to 60 years has decimated the processing infrastructure.

North Carolina is seeing

phenomenal growth in the local food

movement. Consumers are taking the USDA's

Know Your Farmer, Know Your Food Campaign

to heart, but a lack of local of slaughter

infrastructure and thus lack of ability --

1 availability of product will hamper the 2 access of that and the success of that 3 program. 4 This intense vertical integration 5 has made it very difficult for any 6 independent farmer or cooperative group to 7 compete financially. 8 Because of processor ownership 9 throughout the entire chain of production 10 these companies can sell poultry products 11 for a lot less than I can. 12 One chick will cost them about 15 cents to produce. 13 14 I will have to pay a dollar for 15 that chick. 16 Feed costs will be two to three 17 times theirs and processing five times 18 their cost. 19 The increasing cost of production 20 means that I cannot be competitive in price 21 with these large companies and, thus, I 22 must depend on the purchases of customers

with more disposal income.

I recognize that this is part --that part of this is an issue of less volume, but demand for what we are producing is growing, however, a lack of local slaughter infrastructure is the greatest area that we face and one that will severely inhibit opportunities for small and midsize poultry producers in the future.

And I do have some recommendations if that would be okay.

SECRETARY VILSACK: If you could just summarize them just because we're running out of time. I need to give Christine five or ten minutes.

MS. PRIDGEN: I think that USDA needs to finalize some mobile meat processing unit regulations so that we can get back up and going to help get local poultry slaughter infrastructure within communities to help rebuild this local food system.

And what's desperately needed is

we need a requirement to allow states to -to allow all states to allow 20,000 bird
slaughter out from under USDA -- under this
USDA exemption until this poultry -- the
USDA poultry slaughter infrastructure is
rebuilt. So we need that as an interim
situation.

USDA grants and loans need to be clearly targeted to facilities for smaller, midsized independent producers or either producers form a cooperative.

The other things we really need for USDA to -- to -- USDA's Rural Development funding for business and industry loans in order to guarantee these loans for the bricks and mortar construction on small and mid scale slaughter facilities.

I would like to ask for more coordination across the Rural Development Program. For example, the USDA value added grant provides for feasibility studies.

This funding would -- could be used by a

group of poultry farmers to work with economic development entities to see how many chickens would need to be grown in order to build a processing facility.

Also, I'd like to see USDA SSIS
to work with owners of small, independent
red meat slaughter houses to add a poultry
slaughter line and to help them with
facility design so that they could meet the
regulations.

The last thing I would like to say is I would like for you to consider how best to implement these recommendations.

And what I want you to think about is if the next generation finds that the only pathway into poultry farming is to incur huge amounts of debts with no assurance of being able to pay it back, they may wisely decide not to farm.

SECRETARY VILSACK: We just had an interesting briefing yesterday with the national press and some of the press in Washington, D. C. about *Know Your Farmer*

1 Know Your Food.

We just completed an inventory, a mapping inventory of all the processing facilities in the country both in terms of cows, in terms of pork and in terms of poultry, and also the rendering facilities. And tried to match it up with where the smaller producers are so that we could determine where the gaps are.

Our Rural Development folks were in the room, they are a part of *Know Your Food*, and they are interested in using the program -- this industry loan program to try to make loans available to those who want to get into that business.

And, as you know -- I mean, you noted, we were are working on regulations relative to these small and local communities. And we have already begun to fund a number of them and we will continue to do that.

So there is a process right now in the last year in the Obama

1 Administration to try to create some energy 2 for that type of activity. 3 Shane, let me give you an 4 opportunity to comment briefly on the 5 GIPSA, DOJ issue and then I'd like to turn it over to Christine for any questions or 6 7 comments she has. 8 MR. WOOTEN: I've never had --9 I've been fortunate, I haven't had some of 10 the situations these other growers have and 11 concerns and things that have happened to 12 them. 13 So, personally, I would -- I 14 don't know much about the GIPSA regulations 15 and stuff. 16 But the only thing I would say 17 about it is maybe make it more public of 18 how to start that process because, you 19 know, I've never needed to, but if I did, I 20 wouldn't know where -- where to start. 21 SECRETARY VILSACK: Well, mention 22 was made of Dudley Butler. And I just --

you know, just so you know, this guy is

here today doing his job. His farmstead 1 2 was recently, for all intense and purposes, totally destroyed, with the exception of 3 his home, as result of recent -- recent 4 5 tornado. 6 So, Dudley, we appreciate you 7 being here notwithstanding your own 8 personal responsibilities. 9 MR. BUTLER: Thank you. 10 MS. VARNEY: Mr. Secretary, I can 11 say the panel -- and I can speak for me, 12 and I have lots of follow-up questions that 13 I don't think I'll be able to get to today. 14 So you can expect to hear from me. 15 But, Mr. Staples, let me say I 16 fully expect you will not experience 17 retaliation by virtue of your presence 18 today, but if you do, you call me at this 19 number. 20 What I really want to follow-up 21 on, Secretary, is this competitiveness on 22 the contracting side. And I have a couple

of questions that I'd like to get the

1 panelists think about if we don't have time 2 talk about now, so certainly during the 3 break and afterwards. 4 I'm very interested in your 5 experience after 23 years when you were terminated. 6 7 Were you able to switch 8 integrators? 9 Were you able to go somewhere 10 else? 11 MS. MORISON: No, we weren't able 12 to switch integrators. Again, even though 13 there's four companies in the area, what 14 one wants, they all want. 15 ASSISTANT ATTORNEY GENERAL 16 VARNEY: How did that -- how does that 17 actually work? 18 I would think that a grower with 19 your -- with your reputation should in a --20 in a competitive market would be fairly --21 it should be fairly easy to switch? 22 MS. MORISON: It -- it really --23 I don't think it really matters as far as

1 reputation goes, it's just a matter of they 2 won't put chickens on the farm and they 3 won't give you a contract, you know. 4 The upgrades that were demanded 5 of us, had we gone to another company, they 6 would have said the same thing. 7 And even though, you know, we had 8 a good growing history, we wouldn't have 9 one with another company, we would have 10 been starting out at the very beginning 11 with a record with a new company. 12 ASSISTANT ATTORNEY GENERAL 13 So, then, it's a reduction in 14 capacity if they're not replacing it or are 15 they expanding somebody else's capacity? 16 What happens when --17 MS. MORISON: All the --18 ASSISTANT ATTORNEY GENERAL 19 -- you're taken -- when your 20 contracts are terminated, is capacity just 21 reduced in your area or do they --22 MS. MORISON: No. They -- they 23 get other people to build houses or, you

1 know, they phase in more birds at other 2 places. 3 No, they -- every year in our 4 area they are increasing production. 5 -- more birds are being produced every 6 year. ASSISTANT ATTORNEY GENERAL 7 8 And I'm very interested in the VARNEY: 9 upgrades that you-all have talked about. 10 Can you tell me a little bit, 11 because I'm here to learn, I don't know 12 that much about your industry. What, in your view, are the kinds 13 14 of upgrades that are reasonable and 15 appropriate and right for the integrators 16 to be -- wanting from their growers? 17 And what are the kinds of baskets 18 of upgrades that are, in your view, are 19 used basically to -- to take you out of 20 business, which is what I'm hearing. 21 What do you say to that? 22 MS. DOBY: Well, sometimes the 23 upgrades can be -- it depends on what

they're asking. Now -- and another thing, it might be the company -- okay. You started out building houses by the company's specs, okay.

And then the company, they decide, well, you know, we're -- we're not going to grow this six pound bird anymore, we're going to grow a nine pound bird.

So that means although you just built these houses four years ago, you're going to have to go back in debt \$80,000 because we want these big fans put in there. We want more cooling system put in there because we're going to this bigger bird and it's got to be cooled more.

So the grower foots that expense for the company to grow the birds that's going to make them more money.

And the thing about it is when you put those upgrades in sometimes like the companies will say, "Okay, we're going to give you -- you do this and we will give you a little bit extra".

But that extra will never cash

flow to the pay for that expense. And

that's where the grower gets in pretty much

debt problem.

MS. PRIDGEN: What I would like to see is from our family's experience and the community's experiencing in North Carolina, these companies are always looking -- when they're looking at expansion, they're looking for new houses, I mean, the newest houses that they can get.

And what I had talked about earlier that happened is when the tobacco allotment buyout was going on, there were farmers who had houses that had been taken on by this company that were former Perdue Growers and they were taken on by Case Farms.

And in that situation they built two new houses to replace the specifications for Case. But what Case did was went out and talked to some farmers who

1 didn't have -- didn't grow poultry, into 2 building brand new houses for them. 3 And, so, when they got those brand new houses, those new farmers to 4 5 start growing, they went back and dropped 6 those houses that they had initially taken 7 on as the former Perdure Growers. 8 So, now, this farmer may have 9 four houses or six houses on his property 10 and maybe only two of them have chickens in 11 them and the other four, even though they 12 have the same equipment in them, you know, 13 don't -- don't have that. 14 ASSISTANT ATTORNEY GENERAL 15 One other question that I have VARNEY: that I think I will probably have to 16 17 follow-up or I'll find it, or anyone could 18 tell me, are you in co-ops? 19 Are there co-ops for the growers? 20 Does it work for you? 21 MS. DOBY: There was one a co-op 22 and it was closed. And that was the last

23

one.

1	ASSISTANT ATTORNEY GENERAL
2	VARNEY: And why don't co-ops work?
3	You're all shaking your head no.
4	Tell me why.
5	MR. STAPLES: They probably
6	would. It's just I guess you need to
7	know some poultry growers. It's just hard
8	it's hard to get a lot of poultry
9	growers to say yes to anything.
LO	ASSISTANT ATTORNEY GENERAL
L1	VARNEY: Any other thoughts?
L2	MR. WOOTEN: Also we have several
L3	grower based companies programs and
L4	and organizations.
L5	I think the we had mentioned
L6	earlier about the debt and the
L7	ASSISTANT ATTORNEY GENERAL
18	VARNEY: Right.
L9	MR. WOOTEN: and and I
20	think a lot of growers are afraid to get
21	too involved with anything that would go
22	against the status quo because of their
23	debt.

1 ASSISTANT ATTORNEY GENERAL 2 VARNEY: Well, Secretary, I have a lot of 3 work to do from this. And I want to really 4 understand our role in the GIPSA process on 5 the complaint side. 6 I'm wondering why complaints are 7 treated confidentially until a certain 8 point in time. 9 I think there's probably more 10 streamlining we could do. 11 Whether or not GIPSA has the 12 authority, we can certainly provide troops 13 and help and do what we can do. 14 I want to understand more about 15 the contracting practices and see what we 16 can do to help make sure that that's a 17 competitive marketplace. 18 And I want to thank all of you. 19 I know you take time out of your -- out of 20 your livelihood to come here and talk to us 21 and on my part to educate me. 22 Thanks. 23 SECRETARY VILSACK: I want to

join with the Assistant Attorney General's remarks about -- to the panel. I want to thank you for taking the time and being able to share, not only your personal stories, but, in some cases, some painful stories of friends and neighbors who have been impacted by this industry.

My commitment to the folks who are here today and to poultry growers across the country is to continue to work hard with Dudley and those in the GIPSA area to make sure that our regulatory system is as good as it needs to be to make sure that growers and producers have a fair shake. I mean, at the end of the day that's ultimately what it's about.

I, too, have learned a good deal here.

And I'm sure, Dudley, it's strengthened his resolve as well to do a good job.

This is obviously an issue that -- that will require a very close analysis.

The Congress has directed us to do that in the 2008 Farm Bill.

We began that process with the rules we published last year in an effort to try to make greater equity in a relationship and to make sure that folks had notice that contracts were going to be terminated, that they weren't left without any opportunity to try to seek alternative contracts and alternate opportunities.

But this is obviously a difficult issue, a set of difficult issues.

And I might say that it is reflective of a deep concern that I share with you today, and that is, about the future of our rural communities generally.

I think it is very important for the rest of the country to know what you know about the challenges and struggles of producers in this country.

I think the rest of us take what you-all do for us for granted, whether it's the producers, or whether it's the folks

who process and slaughter the livestock or 1 2 the folks who -- who pick our fruits and 3 vegetables along the entire stream here, 4 we, as a country, do not appreciate and do 5 reflect our appreciation for those who give us a safe, abundant, affordable supply of 6 7 food, which is really puts us in a much more competitive circumstance economically. 8 So we owe you a fair shake. 9 10 I'm committed to doing that as long as I'm 11 the Secretary of Agriculture. With that, let me ask you to show 12 13 your appreciation for the panel and we will 14 reconvene shortly after lunch. 15 (Whereupon, the taking of the 16 proceedings were recessed from 17 approximately 12:00 p.m. to 18 approximately 1:00 p.m., after 19 which the following proceedings 20 were had and done:) 21 MR. FERRELL: I think we'll get 22 started. 23 In the front, and the people in

the middle, if you want to provide comments 1 2 -- if you want to provide a comment, you 3 should have picked up a ticket at the -- at 4 the front of -- as you came in the 5 building. 6 And what I'm going to ask is, I'm 7 going to ask -- there's going to be a couple of options here. 8 9 We have two microphones up front 10 here. And if about, you know, five to ten, 11 twelve people can get in a -- in a row on 12 each side in front of the microphone. 13 And you're going to have two 14 minutes to provide some comments. 15 Our goal is to get as many folks 16 who would like to provide a comment the 17 ability to do so. 18 So as you come up to the 19 microphone, we'll have someone that's going 20 to take your ticket from you. So that way 21 we know that everyone who wanted to provide 22 a comment has -- has be given the

opportunity to do so. And then we'll pick

23

this up again later on this afternoon. 1 2 For -- for growers who do not 3 want to speak at the microphone, we have 4 other -- some other options as well. 5 Straight out these double doors, down the hallway, we have a conference room 6 7 off to the left. And we have some GIPSA 8 employees that will take your comments 9 directly that way as well. 10 So if you -- it's up to you where 11 you would like to provide your comments. 12 So why don't we go ahead and get 13 started and we'll start on this side. BROTHER DAVID ANDREWS: 14 Thank 15 My name is Brother David Andrews. you. Ι 16 am hear reading the statement of a grower 17 who not only couldn't -- was afraid to come 18 as well as afraid to speak. So I'm 19 speaking on half of someone else. 20 First of all, let me give a word 21 of gratitude for all the time that you have 22 dedicated to this process. You and your

time is greatly appreciated.

23

From a grower's perspective I

want to assert that the system is broken.

The current system is one that favors the integrators and allows for the manipulation of outcomes to growers primarily through the tournament system.

While the lack of competition creates one set of problems, the tournament system creates another set. It takes money from the growers and gives it to another group.

The grower has no control over the quality of the feed that gets delivered, nor how much of each type is delivered.

Another compound -- component to the cost equation is the chick cost. The integrator has complete control over the quality of the chicks delivered to the farm.

Another form of manipulation is to exclude the best growers and worse growers in the average cost calculation.

Another aspect of the tournament
system is related to time between flocks.

The tournament system benefits the
integrators when farms similar in
performance sell in the same week. This is
easily achieved by manipulating out times
and grouping similarly performing farms.

The tournament system that is common in the poultry industry is the only example that I know of that has the employees-growers subsidizing the success of the employers.

Thank you.

MR. FERRELL: Okay. We'll start over here. If can you introduce -- if you can mention what your name is, too. Thank you.

TOM GREEN: Mr. Butler, poultry growers and other interested parties. My name is Tom Green and I'm a former Coffee County, Alabama poultry grower. Before that I -- I had a dual military career. I was an infantryman.

1 And I served in the aviation 2 branch as a pilot. I flew combat missions in Vietnam 3 and also served as a public affairs officer 4 5 at the Army Aviation Center. 6 I went into the poultry growing business in 1990. 7 I was 52 years old at the time. 8 9 We were both excited about going into the 10 new business, totally different from 11 anything in our past. Poultry fit our 12 plans to take us into our golden years. 13 We invested a little more than 14 \$500,000 to build four 500 foot poultry 15 houses on our 90 acres of land just south 16 of Enterprise. And we depended entirely on 17 company advice and the SBA and our bankers. 18 The SBA financed -- they didn't 19 finance, but they guaranteed our loan. 20 As frequent problems arose 21 repetitively we -- we sought advice from 22 other growers. And over time formed a

cooperative that gave us better prices on

23

1 supplies and equipment. And all growers 2 said that we could fill outside of the 3 company influence that was bringing our 4 prices down. 5 It also served as a forum in which growers could come together, discuss 6 7 issues and express solutions. 8 We communicated with the USDA packers and stockers to initiate 9 10 investigations of irregular suspected and 11 greater activities. 12 We appealed to DOJ's Antitrust 13 Division on issues. 14 I had one substantive complaint 15 forwarded to the DOJ from packers. And the 16 action -- for an action review. It was returned to me 14 months later without 17 18 action. 19 As a cooperative we participated 20 in workshops to improve our company-grower 21 relations. Contract equity was our primary

Our contracts continued to be

22

23

goal.

written on a flock-to-flock basis and could be terminated by either party with a 10-day notice for any reason or no reason at all.

These contracts were written at the grower's expense for equipment, housing upgrades and no regard for compensation to offset expenses.

In October 1995 Hurricane Opal -Opal blasted through Alabama and took out a
large number of poultry farms. Many of the
more vulnerable, older farms were totaled.

This gave the integrators an opportunity to bring new projects on, which they vigorously pursued.

Along with the expansion of new farms, the integrators demanded upgrades for tone ventilation and new equipment for the older farms, for the ventilators on those farms, which, at that time, would have been a one hundred thousand upgrade to our debt load.

Our new -- our new contracts contained upgrade requirements.

1 Also contained a demand for growers to sign mandatory arbitration in 2 3 order to settle any disputes that may come 4 up. 5 Any -- any grower not signing the 6 arbitration clause by January 15, 1996, 7 will be terminated and would not receive chickens. This was also brought to the 8 attention of the packers and stockers. 9 And 10 they sent somebody down to investigate and 11 it resulted in nothing. 12 MR. FERRELL: Sir, if you can 13 make -- we're going to try to make sure we 14 get everyone as possible. 15 MR. GREEN: Okay. I've got one 16 paragraph left. 17 MR. FERRELL: But in our next 18 round of comments, we're going to try to 19 get as many people so you might be able 20 take another crack at it. 21 We just want to make sure that 22 everyone has, at least, once chance. 23 MR. GREEN: Okay. This was the

1 straw that broke the camel's back -- broke 2 this camel's back. And my -- Ruth and I 3 talked about it at length about the 4 principles, about what happening to us. 5 We talked to lawyers, packers, 6 Birmingham SBA, everybody. Nobody could 7 help. We were not allowed to sell our 8 houses and we were not allowed to go with 9 10 any other of the other companies of the 11 three that were working in our area. 12 Ruth and I chose to stand our 13 principles. We did not give up a 14 fundamental right to access the public court of law and guaranteed -- which is 15 16 guaranteed by our Constitution, regardless 17 of price. 18 I had flown too many combat 19 missions defending that Constitution 20 before. 21 It was truly ironic that 22 protecting one right, we lost another. Wе 23 lost the right to property. We lost 77

acres, four outstanding poultry facilities and five years of hard work. It was sold for a hundred and seventy-seven thousand dollars salvage.

We were denied our right to property by the company acting unconscionably and in my lawyer's mind, they were criminally acting.

Thank you.

CRAIG WATTS: My name is Craig
Watts. I've been a contract a poultry
producer since 1992. I'm careful not to
use the term independent because I do not
feel today that we're independent, I feel
like we're more of a captured supplier.

The competition on the production end of -- as it relates to us, the growers, it does not exist, it does not exist.

We have no voice in an industry that we're so heavily invested in. Growers mortgage farms and homes based on an assumption that the relationship with the poultry company will be long term and

1 mutually beneficial, but what we get is a 2 growing agreement with no security at all.

Contracts can be terminated at any time for any reason and as growers we have no recourse.

Contracts can be changed at any time for any reason. And we're, you know, forced to sign a contract whether we like it or not on a take it leave it basis because, you know, we can either sign it or face bankruptcy. It's almost like asking a question, would you rather drown or burn? Either way, it's not a good way to go.

Another major issue is a method of compensation, which this has been beat to death, but it's called the ranking system or the tournament system. I've heard it called a reward system, when it's actually the grandest Ponzi scheme that's ever been invented.

Timing is everything. What you get, who you get, when you get it has more to do than any managerial decision that

1 I'll ever make. And -- and also influences
2 my compensation, you know.

The ranking system serves as a cost control method for the companies.

That's what it boils down to. It's no reward system for a grower, you know.

They say, "Well, there's some bad growers come out here and you're complaining".

I've got proof different. For what it's worth, I'm a very above average grower, but I see the faults in it. For me to make it up here, somebody is getting rid of down here. That's the way I see it.

Anybody in this room knows that there is no such thing as a level playing field, the inputs. There's just too many variables. Quality of chicks. Quality of feed. The feed deliveries. And the beat just goes on, you know. The stuff that's outside of our control is almost endless. That is irrefutable.

But when they want to compensate

us, they pretend we've got a level playing 1 2 field. 3 All I ask you to do, as Congress, 4 is prohibit poultry companies from being 5 able to cancel our contracts just arbitrarily. 6 7 I ask the USDA and the Department 8 of Justice to declare the ranking system 9 unfair and deceptive. 10 Thank you. 11 WARREN GRANGER: Good afternoon. 12 I'm Warren Granger from Alva, Oklahoma. 13 I'm a former poultry farmer of 22 years. 14 grew chickens for a large Arkansas multi 15 national company. 16 This hearing is a monumental 17 event for growers in America. As a poultry 18 grower I spoke out about the unfairness of 19 the contracting system through state and 20 national poultry organizations and any 21 media that would listen. Several pieces of state and 22 23 national legislation were introduced over

the last three decades, only to be stifledby lobbyists of big chicken.

Numerous complaints were filed by me and many others to the Packers and Stockyards Administration, but to no avail.

Growers were told that the PS&A has no teeth to enforce legitimate claims of the many injustices inflicted on growers as is David against Goliath.

15 years ago I secretly recorded the broiler plate pay clerk telling me how I and members of the Oklahoma Contract Poultry Growers Association were targeted and how my grower pay was manipulated for trying to bring about change to an unfair contracting system.

This silent recording was turned over to the PS&A at that time. We were told that the DOJ, Department of Justice, was understaffed and only went after the big stuff.

Recently 50 poultry growers in Southeast Oklahoma filed a lawsuit against

a giant poultry company from Arkansas for 1 2 fraud, negligence and violation of the 3 Oklahoma Consumer Protection Act. 4 Groups of seven growers at a time 5 are scheduled for separate trials over the course of the next several months. 6 7 The first trial ended in April 8 with the first group being awarded 8.3 9 million. Punitive damages were rewarded 10 against the company. 11 And by the way, my secret 12 recording of 15 years earlier was used as 13 evidence in this trial. 14 Question, why are some of our 15 land grant universities advocating for the 16 large poultry farmer? 17 Right here today we have a PhD 18 that will be on this panel after while that 19 testified for the giant Arkansas 20 corporation in the Oklahoma trial from 21 Oklahoma State University. 22 I thought land grant universities 23 were suppose to research and teach

1 prospective ag producers viable methods to 2 produce food and fiber as to receive a fair 3 and equitable return on investment. 4 Why are PhD's testifying for big 5 corporations against the growers? The poultry farming business is 6 7 misaligned. We need your help to level the 8 playing field. 9 I would like to say thank you to 10 the Secretary of Agriculture and the U.S. 11 Attorney General and all these other 12 officials for hearing the concerns of 13 farmers across America. 14 Thank you. 15 MR. RUDY HOWELL: My name is Rudy 16 Howell and I'm thankful y'all are listening 17 to us. 18 I have grown birds 15 years and I 19 am very concerned about the payment system 20 that being based on true competition. 21 Grower pay can be easily manipulated by the 22 company. 23 For instance, incorrect feed

deliveries, incorrect feed weights,
inaccurate bird count and easily changing
documentation, all which affect grower's
ranking and pay.

I feel like the USDA and the

I feel like the USDA and the
Department of Justice should take
aggressive action to enforce the law
against unfair and deceptive trade
practices and acknowledge the current pay
system as unfair and deceptive.

Thank you.

MR. LAMAR JACKSON: My name is

Lamar Jackson. I've been growing poultry

for 30 years. And I would like to thank

you people for coming here today,

distinguished guests. I could spend all my

time thanking you for just being here.

It's a great pleasure to have somebody to

listen to us.

We, as growers, appreciate your concerns for our well-being in becoming successful growers in these United States.

Integrators, in general, want

everything left alone. They want no new laws to interfere with their business as usual policy as they have it now.

The system is definitely a broken one in extreme need of repair.

This administration has an opportunity to help individual growers to supply our nation, as well other nations with a healthy food product, poultry.

We need the USDA packers and stockers to mandate policies that enable our already existing enforces, along with the Department of Justice, to be able to rigidly enforce and prohibit mandatory upgrades on housing and equipment that are totally unnecessary to the cost effective production of poultry in this country.

These upgrades require countless more hours of kilowatt energy to produce these birds to market. Keeping the grower in constant debt gives the integrators assurance that these growers will have to continue to grow poultry for them.

This eliminates competition and thus makes their stronghold on growers evident.

Let me say that numerous growers are not attending these workshops because of being afraid of retaliation on them by their integrator.

A grower this morning has already been threatened by his service person if he attends and speaks at this forum.

All the integrator has to do is make sure that particular grower receives inferior chicks to start a grow out with and maybe short his feed delivery, which can lead to a higher feed conversion rate. This happens, really it does.

This is the type of undue fair practices that need to be addressed now. Our payment ranking schedule is also totally unfair.

On a farm the size of mine, which is a hundred and eight thousand broilers, my paycheck, in a five-week grow out

period, can vary as much from \$22,000 gross 1 2 down to \$11,000 for the same amount of 3 chickens. 4 This makes it impossible to meet 5 financial obligations and be able to plan 6 any future endeavors. Please enforce the laws already 7 8 in place by giving the USDA packers and 9 stockers real authority to do their jobs in 10 order to help us and this industry. 11 Thank you very much for your 12 time. 13 MR. BUTLER: Hold on, hold on. 14 This is Alan Christian, my deputy. I want 15 you to tell him about who got threatened, 16 not -- not right here, just go back and 17 tell him who -- what the name. MR. JACKSON: I sure will. 18 19 And I did say this, one more 20 time. I've been doing this for 30 years. 21 It might be just 31 because I'm gone, too, 22 but that's okay. 23 MR. MICKEY BLOCKS: I'm Mickey

1 Blocks.

The lack of competition of giving geographic regions has led to the integrators with all of the power, this leaves the grower with little or no choice.

The grower is given a contract, it's one sided, it's a take it or leave it situation. Companies should not have that much control in a region.

DOJ and USDA need to do
everything possible to limit this type of
power because this power is unfair and
deceptive practices have developed, for
example, the ranking system, forced
upgrades, contracts that can be changed or
cancelled at any time.

Compensation, as I have not kept up with increases in energy and material costs.

These are all signs of a broken system that needs to be corrected as soon as possible.

Thank you.

1 MR. ROBBIE STAULTS: I am Robbie 2 Staults from the Shenandoah Valley of 3 Virginia. And I want to thank you for 4 taking time to listen to my comments. 5 I'm here to share my experience 6 of contract poultry production. In 1979 I 7 bought a two house poultry farm contracting with a major chicken company. The income 8 9 from the farm was enough to allow me to pay 10 labor and my bank note. 11 Things were going so well that in 12 1992 I decided to build two additional 13 houses. 14 After five years, I was required 15 to perform company upgrades for all four 16 During this time operating 17 expenses were on the rise, the pay from the 18 chicken company was not being increased. 19 Now, I have an increased bank 20 note along with increasing expenses, but my 21 income, it remains static. 22 My plans for early retirement

began to evaporate. After a couple of

23

1 years operating in this manner, I came to 2 the realization that I was no never going 3 to pay for these new houses. This is a 4 common cycle that chicken farmers are 5 trapped in. Does that matter, does it matter 6 7 what state or region you're in, no. 8 That's why today is so important. We need USDA and the Department of Justice 9 10 to stop requiring growers to install 11 expensive upgrades in their poultry houses 12 at their own expense. And Congress should stop poultry 13 14

And Congress should stop poultry companies from cancelling grower contracts without adequate faults, unless they reimburse growers for the investment they made to service the contract.

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

Thank you for your time.

MR. FRANK MORRISON: My name is
Frank Morrison. I am an ex-contract
poultry grower from Maryland. Our contract
was terminated two years ago due to not
upgrading to the company standards.

One of the major challenges facing contract growers is the ranking system.

I have an example, which happened to us. I could purchase propane for 30% cheaper than what the poultry company was charging us.

When I informed the company I was going to purchase and supply my own propane as any independent business person would, I was told if I did not -- if I did, my contract would be terminated. Even if we wanted to be competitive, the company will not let us.

This contract system has taken away the entrepreneurial spirit of the farmer who has for decades found ways to reduce costs on their farms to stay in business.

The USDA and DOJ need to take aggressive action and enforce the law against unfair and deceptive trade practice by the poultry companies.

1 Thank you.

MS. VALERIE ROWE: Good afternoon. My name is Valerie Rowe. I'd like to thank you for this opportunity to speak with you today regarding the current situation as a poultry grower.

I became a poultry grower four years ago. I did this in an attempt to save a family farm that was in the process of foreclosure due to an unfair contract.

That resulted in my elderly inlaws birds being cut off, without notice, on the day of delivery because they refused to make expensive and unnecessary upgrades.

The problem has turned out to be an industry wide issue regardless of who you grow for or what type of bird you raise.

I have learned that a contract is a contract in name only. Mine was suppose to be a 5-year contract. It has changed four times in as many years.

Integrators routinely rewrite

these so-called contracts to their benefit wherever they see fit. And depend on the fact that the grower is deep in debt and will sign them out of fear in order to continue getting checks.

I thank God my husband and I have nonfarm jobs. Without them, we could not afford paying out of our pocket to raise chickens. We will not be able to continue this much longer.

The solution to this systemic problem, the USDA, along with the Department of Justice, must exercise their power and stop these unfair contracts now.

Thank you.

MR. WILLIAM CRAMER: Thank you.

My name is William Cramer and I work for
the Interface Center on Court

Responsibility. We are a faith based

membership organization who investors

members own a hundred and ten million -billion dollars in shares in companies like

Tyson, Smithfield and Hormel.

1 Our members come from a variety of faiths, Methodists, Baptists, 2 3 Episcopalians, Catholics and many others. 4 In addition to owning shares in 5 major meat companies, restaurants and food 6 distributors, our members also manage large 7 health care systems that buy a lot of food. Our members are increasingly 8 concerned about the conditions under which 9 10 their food is produced. 11 They're especially concerned 12 about fair treatment of poultry growers and 13 chicken processing workers. 14 We believe strongly that contract 15 poultry growers are the backbone of the 16 rural economy in the South. When they are 17 paid low prices, they make poverty wages 18 and that hurts rural communities. 19 We also feel that the industry is 20 currently structured as unfair to workers. 21 The lack of competition and poultry 22 processing means companies can violate 23 workers' basic rights and disregard health

and safety. As a result, worker turnover

at poultry averages about a hundred percent

a year. We need goods jobs in rural areas

of the South and this industry isn't

providing them.

There's enough money in the supply chain for everyone to get a fair share, but we need to enforce regulations that promote fair competition so mega corporations like Walmart and Tyson don't take more than their fair share.

The poultry processing -- the
United of States of America was founded on
principles of freedom and free enterprise.
Without fair competition, we do not have
true freedom or free enterprise.

The poultry processing industry in America is increasingly monopolized and that is un-American.

Our organization and people of faith around the country are watching these hearings and other efforts to restore competition and fairness in food and

1 agriculture in America. 2 We hope to see better enforcement 3 of our existing laws and more effective 4 regulations coming out of these hearings. 5 For people of faith gathered here 6 today I ask you to consider the following 7 questions: If Jesus were here today what would he say about grower fairness and 8 9 worker justice? 10 Who would he support? 11 Thank you. 12 MS. ANGIE TYLER: Thank you for 13 hearing our concerns and hopefully you're 14 compassionate. 15 My name is Angie Tyler. And I'm 16 the only grower here from Louisiana. 17 proudly represent everyone of them. 18 been a tough year for us. 19 My husband and I have been 20 raising broilers for 20 years now. And, as 21 I said, I'm the only one here from our 22 state.

There's a lot of things that need

to be addressed. And this is not one producer, this is not one integrator, this is nationwide.

And the decisions that y'all make here today and in the weeks to come, months to come, even years to come, can be remembered by the whole agricultural community historically. This has never been done before.

And what we feel is that the USDA must take action immediately on any unfair practices. The poultry farmers in our country are on the brink of collapse.

The ranking system of payment is obsolete, it's broken, and it needs to be changed. There's too much room there for manipulation. And there's no checks and balances whatsoever.

And because costs have far exceeded the pay raises, producers cannot pay their bills, they can't pay the production costs.

Energy has increased so many

1 times more than the pay has increased. And 2 many times the pay has gone down. 3 The USDA needs to enforce laws 4 already in place and investigate these 5 unfair practices. 6 Poultry remains the most 7 economical and healthy source of protein in 8 our country. As the demand in domestic and 9 foreign markets increase, along with the population, our poultry production has to 10 11 increase also. The farmers are absolutely 12 mandatory for this. 13 And we must ensure, not only 14 survival, but the potential for success and 15 progress as our future. And we're relying 16 on you for that help to make sure that we 17 can stay in business and do our jobs and do it right. 18 19 And we want to do that job in a 20 marketplace that is fair. It's our 21 future. 22 Thank you. 23 MR. CHRIS SANDERS: Good

afternoon. My name is Chris Sanders. I'm with United Food and Commercial Workers.

On behalf of my president and the thousands of members and my local union in Kentucky and Southern Indiana, and dozen of people wearing gold shirts in this room, my brothers and sisters, and literally 250,000 poultry workers across America, we want you — to ask you to pay special attention to the needs of folks who kill, cut and process chickens.

We're here about competition in issues in agriculture, but agriculture is nothing without consumers and, of course, retailers.

So pressure on growers and vendors, producers and us all across the industry come from the margins that are dictated by retailers. I don't mind naming names, I'm talking about Walmart.

Until we get some grip on the control that major retailers like Walmart have in this industry, we won't get

1 anywhere.

Walmart, of course, is not the only grocery in this industry, but all grocers are taking their cues from the -- from America's largest grocer, Walmart.

In competition we all know the word monopoly, the control of whenever one supplier has a grip on the industry.

But I want us to learn a new word today. It's monopsony. Monopsony is the tyranny of the retailer when all roads and all products goes to one place. And that's Walmart.

We have to do something about this because until we do something about Walmart its pressures on agriculture margins, we really won't get anywhere at all.

For our people, for my members and my industry, we can't make a living wage until Walmart is able to pay the companies more. It's just a fact, it's reality.

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

There's so much pressure on margins that everybody is getting -- is getting squeezed. And for our folks, Black, White, Hispanic, just doing their best to make a living wage, that will never get any better until we get some improvements in the way that Walmart has a grip on the industry.

So I'm here today on behalf of 200,000 poultry workers or more. Please do something to put real competition in retail so we can all survive and thrive.

Thank you.

MR. ANDY STONE: Hello. My name is Andy Stone, I'm from Mississippi. I've got a couple of comments to make on some stuff I heard here today before I get started reading my statement.

One of the things that was mentioned here today was communication was a problem in the industry. I can assure I've had a lot of communication with my integrator, sometimes at arm length,

sometimes no length, nothing changed when I left.

And y'all's challenge here today is listen to us communicate to y'all, but if y'all do like the integrator, when I leave, if y'all do anything, we're not any better today than we were yesterday.

When I started growing chickens in 1995 I bought land and moved 60 miles from where I grew up. I moved to the broiler capitol of my state.

I did this thinking that I had a -- that I had a reason -- that if I had a reason to switch from one integrator to another I could.

After a few months into the business I realized that the integrators have an unwritten pact with their sister integrators, "You don't take our growers and we won't take yours".

I built three modern houses, equipped it with all the bells and whistles available and approved by the integrator.

I had a 15-year note on a \$300,000 loan, 1 2 but my contract was good for one year. 3 I remember expressing my concern 4 to a company representative and being told, 5 "Don't worry about that, we will always 6 need chickens, that's just how things are 7 done". 8 Six months into my first year my representative came out and said that the 9 10 company was offering a raise. 11 I said, "Wow, that's good. Six 12 months into the business and already going 13 to give me a raise". 14 However, there was a small 15 stipulation attached to this raise. To get 16 the raise, I had -- I had to add equipment 17 to my houses. 18 I told the representative, "I 19 don't want to add equipment to my houses, 20 they're new". 21 He said, "Fine. If you don't add 22 the equipment, you won't qualify for the 23 raise".

So I added the equipment.

My problem is that there is no guarantee that my integrator will continue to contract with me. As a result, raising chickens involves a tremendous -- tremendous sense of insecurity.

This past February I received a letter from my integrator stating, and I quote, "If you fail to provide the proper environment, we may not be in a position to place birds in your care in the future".

I received this letter because my service representatives noticed several blind birds on my farm. At the time of the letter my overall ranking was at the 14%.

Since that time, overall ranking has climbed and put me in the top 10% of the company, yet I have to wonder one from flock to the next if my company will be in a position to put birds in my care.

This insecurity hanging over my head each day that grow chickens. You can argue this and say no one's job is secure

in today's economy, but the situation is not the same.

Your job is a job. My job is a job with a huge debt attached to it. With my debt load, coupled with my standing in the company, I should not have to worry about the company being in a position to place birds in my care.

The situation in contract poultry growing is out of control. The companies have so much power the growers always end up at a disadvantage.

It's time for the government to step up and rein in these companies so that growers are treated more fairly. That's why the hearing today is so important, but a hearing isn't enough, we need the USDA and the Department of Justice to stop poultry companies from requiring growers to install expensive upgrades in the poultry houses at their own expense.

And Congress should stop poultry companies from cancelling growers contracts

1 without adequate cause unless they 2 reimburse the growers for the investments they've made to service the contract. 3 Thank y'all. 4 5 MR. BRUCE FAULT: My name is Bruce Fault. I'm from Fairmont, North 6 7 Carolina. And thank you for this 8 opportunity to speak with you. In an effort to remain within the 9 10 time allotted me, I would like to address 11 the quality of birds that are supplied to me by my integrator. 12 13 In my experience of 16 years, if 14 I am supplied with a good quality input I 15 am able to grow a good quality chicken. 16 If the quality of the chicks is 17 poor, we are unable to produce enough 18 weight to pay the bills. We work harder 19 with a poor flock than we do with a good 20 flock. 21 Under the current ranking system 22 this can significantly -- significantly

impact our overall income. The ranking

system is just unfair and needs to be corrected immediately.

I would like to see the USDA, along with the DOJ, use the tools already available to them to stop this unfair pay system immediately.

Thank you.

SHEILA: My name is Sheila. I would like to say that we really enjoy the chicken business and the company we work for, but we would like to see a few changes to be made.

We would like the ranking system to be different because of the unfairness of it. Your ranking depends on the quality of chicks, age of your houses, how it's been, premium or not.

We cannot control the quality of chicks we get because of such things as diseases, the handling of the eggs and the delivery of the chicks.

Things can go wrong not being there on the spot, but at the end of batch

we are asked what went wrong, why does certain things happen such as the chicks did not grow, they did not put on weight or they lost their life.

And then it starts, you need to upgrade to premium so you can do better.

We tried to explain upgrades cost money, which we do not have.

And their solution to the upgrade is that you will get the incentive pay, which is a half cent more per pound, which will not pay for all of that, for the upgrades in a reasonable amount of time.

And the chicks being with the companies, we would like to see the companies contribute more than just two incentive checks per year for the propane, which is greatly appreciated, if it falls in the right time frame.

The farmer has to take care of the litter. And we have to do the PLT, the BWT, the sawdust and light bulbs for two loads per house per year. The utilities,

such as gas, propane, diesel, electricity,
water, supplies and maintenance.

It would be nice if the company would give more and give a cost of living raise since we have not had a raise in about three years or more, but that does not stop the rising prices of the gas and the diesel, propane, the electricity and supplies.

My husband and I have had to go to our banker several times to try to get a solution to keep paying our loan and our bills from batch to batch.

And the banker has said to us he does not know how we have survived and how we are making it. Now we are trying to reduce our loan just to make it.

And we are trying to -- just trying to pay our bills and the credit cards off from the propane.

Again, I would like to stress as to how you much we enjoy the chicken business and would like to see the USDA and

the Department of Justice declare the
ranking system as an unfair system and to
stop poultry companies from requiring
growers to install expensive upgrades in
their poultry houses at their own -- at our
expense.

MR. JAMES SHACKLEFORD: Yes. My name is James Shackleford and I'm here representing RWDSU Workers of America. And it's an honor to be here today before you.

You know, after working 18 years in a poultry facility, poultry plant, chicken plant, you know, and the things that you see go on and people talking about it's not enough, you're not making this, you're not making this. It's just a blessing for me to see both sides of it because I never knew, you know, this side of it.

I was granted to be a representative -- a union representative three years ago and now I see the other side. And that's why I'm here today.

And it's not about I, I, I, it's 1 2 we, it's a team thing. It's no I in team 3 because we have the growers, you have the producers, you have the packers, you have 4 5 the laborers. 6 And the laborers, you know, I 7 come and stand look out for the laborers today because without the laborers you have 8 9 -- you have no -- no product. I mean, you 10 know, the worker they -- they put it on the 11 market. 12 Also consumers, all of us are. 13 I jus left a restaurant just a 14 minute ago and they couldn't keep enough 15 off it on the bar, you know. 16 So it's not shortage of it, we've 17 just got to figure out and get an 18 understanding of where -- where the monies 19 -- the monies -- you know, thoroughly 20 distribute the monies, you know. 21 We're here today standing 22 together for -- for my workers because

without them, you know, you're not going to

1 have -- I heard a guy say today about 2 vision for your child, you know, the 3 grower, I understand that. 4 But also the worker have a vision 5 also. And their vision is to want their kids to work in a poultry plant and make a 6 7 decent living. 8 And, you know, after working 30 9 years in a poultry plant, leave with a 10 decent pension where you can enjoy a decent 11 life and not to automatically write the worker off because the worker do play an 12 13 important part also. 14 So I just -- I pray that God 15 bless the producer and God bless the packer 16 because when you guys get together and you 17 can come together in -- in peace, it makes 18 it great for the worker. 19 Thank you. 20 MR. TOMMY HINES: My name is 21 Tommy Hines. I'd like to comment on the

systemic problem that the poultry industry

has within intimidation to the growers.

22

I've spoken to numerous growers about attending this meeting, but most of them were afraid to come for fear of retribution from their poultry company.

As growers we have invested everything we own in this business. The industry does not treat the grower as a contractual partner with the company, we are merely someone hired to take care of the birds for them.

You have to do as you are told or you could be refused placement of birds or could face a drop in the number of birds places or worse.

We need there to be more oversight from the USDA, Department of Justice or help from Congress and more enforcement of the Packers and Stockyard Act.

There is a lack of competition from the companies for the growers in business now and, therefore, no, incentive to change the behavior towards growers.

There should be mutual give and take and mutual respect as business partners.

I'd like to say thanks to the growers here today for taking this opportunity to show support for this workshop and a chance to be counted and our hope to change this industry.

Thank you.

MR. STEVE ADCOCK: I'm Steve
Adcock. I'm Legislative Coordinator for
the Campaign for Contract Agriculture
Reform.

Poultry is arguably the most broken of agricultural markets where the processor sector has such total domination that producers are coerced, not only to sign one-sided take or leave it contracts, but also to borrow as much as a million dollars to build facilities on their own farms for the right to grow the company's chickens with merely a one flock, seven-week guarantee of payment.

And the payment, itself, often

represents a negative return on investment.

To anyone hearing this it would sound like one of the worse investments possible and anyone would be foolish to fall into such deal, but the growers that get sucked into the systems are not stupid, far from it.

For a poultry grower the cycle begins with deception about the income stream a grower will enjoy if they build the expensive chicken houses and signed a contract.

But the rosy plans of income are never put into writing, so there's no way to enforce the promise -- the promises.

The contracts themselves are quite another story, but once the grower bites the hook and goes deep into debt they start a cycle of debt burden from which it is very difficult to escape.

The attention of USDA and DOJ that you-all are giving to this issue today is quite historic. And I applaud both

agencies for hosting this discussion and for asking the right questions.

But this process will be meaningless unless it ushers in an era of aggressive enforcement. Both the Packers and Stockyards Act, as well as the DOJ Antitrust authorities, to restore competition and fairness to the poultry sector.

Though not perfect, these statutes are very strong and the failing of enforcement by your predecessors has been nothing short of shameless.

In closing, it's important to mention that the growers who are speaking here today do so at their own risk. And you've heard a lot about that.

The threat of retaliation for a grower speaking out publicly is well documented. And even in the last 48 hours we've had growers who have been threatened not to attend this meeting and not to speak out.

1 So for every grower here today, 2 there are many others who have stayed home for fear of retaliation. And that is more 3 4 than just a communication problem. 5 So I strongly urge both agencies 6 to do everything in your power to protect 7 those growers here today from retaliation and to take it the aggressive enforcement 8 9 action to bring some balance of market 10 power to the poultry sector. 11 Thanks. 12 Hi, I'm B. J. MR. B. J. HYDE: 13 Hyde. I just wanted to touch on how we get 14 paid. 15 We get paid by a feed conversion, 16 the amount of feed it takes to get the 17 birds to a certain weight. The problem 18 with that is the feed gets manipulated a 19 lot. 20 For example, during the

wintertime, a lot of times they'll put this

that they get out whiskey bales instead of

corn mash in it, instead of feed grain,

21

22

corn, you know, should be in it. And we 1 2 have no control over that whatsoever. 3 -- it's just absolutely -- the feed 4 conversion is where they want it. I mean, 5 it's -- we have nothing to say about it. I also want to touch on some of 6 7 these upgrades that they make you do. also wasn't you to use certain vendors and 8 9 such as that, they won't accept anybody 10 else. So they kind of manipulate us that 11 way, too. 12 That's all I've got to say. 13 Thank you. 14 MR. OMAR HOLCOMB: Hi, my name is 15 Omar Holcomb. I live in South Marshall 16 County. And I want -- two things I want to 17 talk to you about. One is the political 18 19 ramifications that are used in chickens. 20 And the other is a little 21 anecdote that happened to me recently. 22 Since I've been doing this for 17 23 years chickens has been used as -- has been 1 a -- been used in politics.

The first time was in the '90's when the steel imports for Russia were -- were -- protections, trades, were put on there. And -- and several ship loads of chickens had to turn around and come home from Russia.

And because somebody is protecting one industry, the farming industry takes it.

And recently the -- there was protection put on tires from China. And China put -- turned around on chickens and stopped it.

So our industry is being used as a, if you want, a political football. And it's a two billion industry in Alabama.

And I doubt the tire industry in Alabama is a two billion, but it's being used that way.

The second is a little anecdote that happened to me two weeks ago yesterday. As I had my chickens -- these

growers will relate this. 1 2 I had my feed up, chickens 3 already, the time came, the catchers all 4 showed up and there we sat because there 5 was a bomb threat at both processing 6 plants. 7 So we sit there for about six hours. And I'm talking to field rep, who's 8 9 really been good to me. She said, "Okay, they'll just 10 11 give you an hour each hour you wait, plus 12 20%". I said, "Okay, what's our 13 14 options? 15 "Well, you can wait another six 16 or seven hours, they'll come back at one 17 o'clock in the morning. 18 By then my birds will have been 19

By then my birds will have been off feed 18 to 20 hours before they pick them up. That means another six hours before they process them, or, said, "We can go in there and lower all the equipment, see if we can get some feed out".

20

21

22

1 And -- because I was totally out 2 of feed. 3 "And then we can raise -- and 4 then we can raise it all up and then 5 process them". 6 Okay. We'll just catch them at 7 one o'clock in the morning. That's what we 8 both decided. 9 Well, I called them a few days 10 "Well, what did they decide to do"? 11 "You competed with everybody 12 else", just like that. They lied to me 13 just straight to my face. I had to compete 14 with them. 15 And that wasn't quite fair, 16 nobody on Monday, Tuesday or Wednesday or 17 Friday had to wait for bomb threats to 18 clear out. 19 Now, I can live with that, but I 20 don't like to be lied to. 21 So thank you very much. 22 MR. TONY GOOLSBY: Thank you. 23 appreciate this opportunity to get to

address this -- this forum. I thank God
for America and I thank God for being born
an American. And I just praise God that
I'll die as an American.

I was born in a little house on a farm in 1950, delivered by a midwife. I don't know how old I was before I ever seen my first doctor. I've lived on a farm all my life. All my ancestors were farmers.

And we go back before the Civil War. Some of my ancestors was here before the White man got here.

In 1997 there was a farm came up for sale, a hundred and five acre farm close my mother and daddy's homestead there. I wanted that hundred and five acres so bad, but I couldn't figure out a way to buy it.

I had a pretty nice little home and 20 acres down at Rainesville, Alabama.

And this company named Cook

Poultry moved into the area and announced
they were building a new poultry breeder,

hatchery and all that kind of stuff. And they were wanting people to -- growers -- wanting to do growers, sign contracts and build houses.

I talked to my banker and I talked to my wife. And my banker said, "Yeah, we can go with you on it if that's what you want to do".

So in 1998 we started the loan process. She and I sold everything we had. Took our savings. We invested probably a hundred and fifty to a hundred and seventy-five thousand of our money.

We borrowed \$600,000 from the bank that was guaranteed by the USDA. And that guarantee was -- had an insurance premium on it that I paid thousands of dollars for that guarantee.

Okay. In a few years into my contract with Cook Poultry they delivered a new set of hens to my farm. Later on that week they came in with a new contract. And they said, "Mr. Goolsby, we want you to

1 sign this new contract". 2 And I said, "Well, I -- we've got 3 a contract". "No, we need you to sign this new 4 5 one". This is in 2002. And I had a 6 7 contract that was still in effect. brand new set of hens in these houses that 8 9 was the top of the line, the best set of 10 hen houses in the area. 11 And I said, "Well, I don't -- I don't understand. I don't see why that you 12 13 want me to sign a new contract when -- when 14 we're under contract with you now". 15 "Well, that's just the way it is. 16 We want you to sign this new contract". 17 I said, "Well, I just -- I think 18 I'll just go with the one I've got". 19 And like Mr. Wooten earlier in 20 the day had said -- I'm from the same 21 county he's from. 22 There's five different 23 integrators in that area up there, you'd

think there would be a lot of competition. 1 2 I had the best set of houses in the 3 country. I told them, "I'll just go with 4 5 this set of hens and I'll -- and I'll see if I can find me a contract with another 6 7 integrator". 8 They said, "No, you can't do You either sign this contract or 9 that. 10 we're going to come pick these hens up". 11 Now, these hens is already on the 12 farm, done been there a week or two. 13 And I said, "Well, you can't do 14 that, we've got a contract, you signed it 15 and I signed it and it's a legal binding 16 contract, you can't do that". 17 "If you don't sign this new 18 contract, we're going to pick them hens up. 19 We'll be here tomorrow morning at six 20 o'clock to pick them up". 21 The next morning at six o'clock, 22 that was on a Wednesday, I was sitting in 23 the driveway when they pulled in and I

1 said, "You need to turn around and go back 2 because you're not getting these hens. 3 I've got a contract with you. And it's a 4 legal binding contract. I'm going to hold 5 you to it, you're not getting these 6 chickens". And, so, they left and they went 7 8 back. 9 On Thursday they had nine lawyers 10 in the Judge's office in the De Kalb County 11 Courthouse behind closed doors. And they 12 got Circuit Judge Randell Cole to issue 13 them a writ of seizure notice against me 14 without my knowledge, without my 15 representation, without any -- any 16 opportunity for me to give my side to the 17 Judge to show him my contract or anything. 18 He issued them a writ of seizure. 19 He sent a copy to the District 20 Attorney's office. 21 He sent a copy to the Sheriff's 22 office on Friday. 23 I didn't know the first thing

about it. 1 2 Monday morning, about daylight, a 3 deputy knocked on my door. And I'd done been up since about 3:30 because of --4 5 you've got to get up early and go feed the chickens, make sure the thing is going. 6 So 7 I was sitting there drinking some coffee. They -- they hand me this writ of 8 9 seizure. And they say, "Tony, the Judge 10 11 has ordered us to come out here and see 12 that the chicken company gets those hens 13 out of your houses". 14 I said, "How can he do that? 15 -- I haven't been notified, I haven't had a 16 hearing. I've got a contract. How can he 17 do that"? 18 "Well, we're just doing our job". 19 "Well, okay". 20 They go to chicken houses. And I 21 get in my truck and I go down there. 22 There's things that needs to be 23 done when you're going to catch chickens.

1	You've got to get your waters up and stuff
2	like that.
3	And I had read every word of the
4	writ of seizure and it didn't say anything
5	about me not going to the chicken houses.
6	Me it just said I wasn't to
7	interfere with them catching them.
8	I go down there and I raised my
9	waters. And I tried to get my equipment
10	ready. And the deputies come. And I come
11	out of the chicken houses there.
12	And they walk up to me and say,
13	"What are you doing down here"?
14	I said, "I'm trying to take care
15	of my equipment I've got \$500,000 in".
16	And they said, "Well, you're not
17	suppose to be there".
18	And, so, I said, "Well, all
19	right, I'll go home".
20	Well, they had the cars pulled in
21	behind my truck and had me blocked.
22	And they said, "No, you're going
23	to stay here until the chief deputy and the

investigator gets up here".

I said "No, if you'll just move your cars, I'll go to the house and get out of your way".

I hadn't broke any law. I hadn't
-- you know, I had threatened anybody,
anything.

"No, you're going to stay here".

So I get in my truck, it's cold weather. I'd just had an accident about a month before, broke my back, broke all my ribs, busted my skull. I was just nearly a dead man. Barely could walk. Sitting in my truck with the heater on and the other police come up.

And they jerked the door open and dragged me out of my truck and downed me and handcuffed me and throwed me in a police car and carried me to jail. Kept me in jail all day, all night. Didn't book me, didn't fingerprint me or nothing until the next morning about four o'clock, 4:30 in the morning.

1 They came and got me and 2 fingerprinted me and charged me with 3 interference with a government operation, 4 put a \$500 bond, and released me on my own 5 recognizance. Told me I could call my wife 6 to come get me. 7 I went home and took a shower and 8 I drunk come coffee, made a few phone 9 calls, and I went Fort Payne. Went to my 10 lawyer's office and gave her \$5,000 to 11 start defending me on them arresting me and 12 everything. 13 Went to the District Attorney's 14 office, he wouldn't talk to me. 15 Went to the Judge's office, he 16 wouldn't talk to me. 17 Went to the Sheriff's office, he 18 wouldn't talk to me. 19 I go back home. I get on the 20 phone and I called a man that was here 21 earlier today, I wish he was still here, 22 Mr. Ron Sparks, the Commissioner of

Agriculture. And he knows me and I know

him. 1 2 And I told him what had happened. And he said, "Tony, I'll" -- this 3 4 was Tuesday about dinner time, a little 5 after dinner. He said, "Tony, I'll be there the 6 7 first thing tomorrow morning and we're going to check into this and we're going to 8 9 do something about this". 10 MR. FERRELL: Sir, if you could 11 just sum it up. 12 MR. GOOLSBY: Tomorrow morning 13 never came. I called two or three days 14 later they let me talk to his assistant. 15 His assistant said, "Mr. Goolsby, 16 I assure you we're looking into this, you 17 will hear from us". That was in 2002. And I've never 18 heard from them. 19 20 The poultry company sued me, Cook Foods sued me and Santa Rosa Farms for 4.4 21 22 million dollars for forcing them into 23 taking such a drastic action.

We went to court. And the jury awarded me a verdict just like that (snapping fingers).

The Judge throwed the verdict out and ruled in the chicken company's favor.

I -- I appealed it down to the State Supreme Court. And the State Supreme Court throwed it out, ruled in the chicken company's favor, but there was one legal point that I had that they couldn't back up on is the jury gave me a verdict, a favorable verdict. I had the right to come back to county court in De Kalb County and start all over again. And, so, we did that.

Cook finally settled with us. We had done sold most of our farm. Done sold our chicken houses to keep our home. We had to sell just nearly everything we had so we'd have a home to live in.

So that's what Cook Poultry done to me. That's a personal -- all these is personal stories that's been told today and

1 everyone of them is true. Every word 2 that's been said today is true. 3 This antitrust thing, the 4 Attorney General, the USDA, you've got the 5 power, but these lobbyists for these integrators and these other big, huge 6 conglomerates that are buying the 7 legislation and buying the actions --8 9 MR. FERRELL: We've got some 10 other people who need to talk, your two 11 minutes --12 AUDIENCE: Let him talk, let him 13 talk. Let him talk. Let him talk. 14 MR. GOOLSBY: I'm proud to be an 15 American, you know, I love this country, 16 but we need our government to step up for 17 us and quit -- quit working for the 18 lobbyists in Washington and down here in 19 Montgomery and start working for the 20 people. Our Constitution says, "We the 21 people". 22 I thank you for the opportunity 23 to speak. And I'm sorry for -- for my

1 emotions, I apologize. Thank you. 2 MR. STALLINGS: Thank you. 3 MR.FERRELL: I think for the remaining four folks, if you want to go 4 5 ahead and give your comments, and then 6 we'll go to the next panel. 7 And then we'll pick it up with 8 more comments after that. 9 Thank you. Proceed. 10 Thank you for MR. GARY KUSHNER: 11 this opportunity. 12 My name is Gary Kushner. 13 serve as General Counsel to the National 14 Chicken Counsel, which is the National 15 Trade Association representing a lot of 16 those bad guys we've just heard about. 17 quess this is one of those days where 18 timing is everything. 19 In fact, I hesitated to rise to 20 the microphone during today's session. 21 Believe it or not, I felt it important that 22 the many fine people who left their farms, 23 traveled long distances to come and share

their grievances deserved to have that
opportunity.

And it's hard not to be moved by the passion with which they tell their personal stories.

But I felt it important, particularly hearing Mr. Goolsby talk about personal stories, to offer the perspective of a lawyer, at least, who represents the integrated poultry industry.

And I only want to make one point, and it is just one point, and it's a legal point because that what these workshops largely about.

And that is that I don't know the facts of any of the specific allegations that we've heard today. And it may well be that there are contracts that are unfair, that are -- that there are contracts of adhesion as a lawyer would call them. That there are contracts that have been breached, that may we'll be the case.

But I've yet to hear anything all

day, other than the word competition, that
links those contracts and those grievances
that these fine people have shared with us
to anti-competitive conduct.

And, certainly, you folks at GIPSA and at the Department of Justice are aware that the law is well settled. Eight Federal Circuit Courts have made very clear that in order to bring a case under the Packers and Stockyards Act alleging unfair or unjustly discriminatory or deceptive practices, there must be a showing of adverse effect on competition.

That's not to say there are no remedies for ill will or for any particular personal experience that may not have been handled properly that may be unjust, it may represent a breach of contract.

We have a long and large body of competent -- contract law well settled in common law and in many states did provide ample remedy.

And where there is true and --

and demonstrated anti-competitive activity,
there is the Packers and Stockyards Act as
well as the -- the number of laws that
Assistant Attorney General Varney touched
upon earlier today.

So I just wanted to make that clear that it's not to belittle any of the stories that we're told today, they are heartfelt and heartwarming, but to just stay clear with purpose, as I understand it of these workshops has been, and that's to discuss competition and the laws under which competition is regulated in the United States.

Thank you very much.

MR. DONALD WALKER: I'm Donald Walker from Oxford, Alabama. I'd like to take this time and to talk about something that's very dear to me.

Valerie helped me with this comment last night, but, Ms. Valerie, I'm not going to do this, I'm going to shoot from the heart.

What Mr. Goolsby just said,
folks, is happening to a lot of people.

This room is full of people that's
bleeding, not from the heart, but from the
hip and it's time this was corrected. The
integrator has run over growers for years
and years.

I've been in the poultry business ever since I was eight years old. I've grown up in the poultry business. I've been in it since '90 on my own.

But it's time that things changed, not just here in Alabama. We've got people all over the Southeast here that's hurting. And it's time that something happened, some way, somehow, things has got to change or the Third World is going to feed us.

This box lunch we got out there for seven dollars and a half, may cost us \$20 ten years down the road if something is not changed, people.

Young people not wanting to get

in the chicken growing end. And I've got two children and I wouldn't advise either one of them to do it. They've seen what it's like, they don't -- they don't want Mother and daddy is having to deal it. with it, so they don't want any part of it. But, again, I just thank you for

the opportunity to be here and I appreciate this time.

ALICIA HARVIE: My name is Alicia Harvie. And I'm here today representing Farm Aid, which is the national nonprofit organization working with family farmers to stay on their land and to thrive.

At Farm Aid we hear from family farmers every day. We've operated a 1-800 hotline since our beginning in 1985. And last year we had just under 1,000 contacts.

What we're hearing from poultry growers has us deeply worried. Nobody knows more about the problems of concentration in the poultry sector than family farmers.

1 But you may notice the smaller 2 turnout at this workshop and smaller lines 3 at other hearings you hold this year. 4 Family farmers are fearful of retaliation 5 from integrators if they comment and for 6 very good reasons. We've heard troubling stories 7 8 about what happens when a farmer speaks out 9 against unfair, one-sided and deceptive 10 contracts, many of the same stories you're 11 hearing today. 12 Farmers are provided with poor 13 quality feed or sick chicks that die within 14 days. 15 Poultry companies halt or delay 16 the delivery of new birds. 17 Farmers are required to make 18 expensive upgrades so they're borrowing 19 without fair compensation, or their 20 contracts are suddenly drop altogether. 21 The lack of antitrust enforcement

in recent decades has been responsible for

the misquided trajectory and limited

22

23

1 balance of our current food system.

The result has been a severely concentrated marketplace in which power and profit are limited to a few at the expense of countless, hardworking family farmers who ask nothing more than a level playing field.

We regret that recent
administrations have turned a blind eye to
the very real threat of corporate
concentration to farm family livelihoods to
these international food security.

We applaud this administration's historic commitment to address issues of competition and concentration in agriculture.

And we urge you to make full use of experience and wisdom of the family farmers you're hearing from today. They are very courageous to be here speaking out against a contracting system that is not just unfair, but plain wrong. Please don't let them down.

1 Thank you.

MR. TERRY TUCKER: My name is

Terry Tucker. I'm proud to say that I am

fourth generation farmer in the community

that I live in. And I hope it don't end

with me as far as my family is concerned.

I've been in the poultry business for 18

years.

We did quite well in the poultry business, but, you know, I also know the different stories and I know the manipulations that go on as well in the poultry business.

I saw my neighbors, you know, lose their farms. I saw both spouses having to go out and take other jobs just to make their payments.

And, you know, as Americans we pride ourself with equality, you know.

We'll send our -- our children, our daughters, our sons, our husbands, our wives off to war to fight for this equality.

And this ranking system that we have in the poultry industry is ridiculous, you know. You've heard a whole different things that's going on in this ranking system, you know, from bird delivery to feed and several others. And I want to address two of those.

And I want to address the bird delivery. One of the things is the fact that, you know, we don't have any control over that if -- I raise straight run birds. And that means that's mixture between male and female birds.

Well, if I get more male birds on my farm and Joe down the road, you know, gets more females, guess who's going to -if he's -- if he's a halfway decent poultry farmer and sees after his chickens, I'm going to beat him out because I got the -I got the more dominant bird, I got the male bird. Now, how fair is that?

Feed delivery, I want to address that for just a minute, you know. If I run

1 out of feed during the course of a grow out 2 and let's just say -- I'm going to throw a 3 number out there. Let's say I'm out of feed for 48 hours. Well, let's say Joe 4 5 down the road, he's not out of feed, we're 6 selling together under this so-called fair 7 ranking system, that's what the integrators say, we know better, guess who's going to 8 9 beat me out, Joe is going to do it. 10 We really need your help from the 11 Justice Department and the Department of 12 Agriculture to look into this ranking 13 system because it's killing us. 14 Yeah, I've made money in the 15 poultry business, I can't stand here and 16 tell you that I haven't, but I've also lost 17 money due to this ranking system. 18 So, please, we need your help. 19 Thank you. 20 MR. FERRELL: I think we're going 21 to go ahead and just take one more comment. 22 And then we'll go to the next panel and

we'll get to that panel; then we'll pick up

23

1 with more comments then.

So if there's still people that would like to provide comments, we'll allow more time to do that later on in the day.

MR. BRAD CAINEY: Thank you for taking my comments. My name is Brad Cainey. I'm from Nashville, Tennessee. And thank you to Farm Aid who informed me about these hearings.

My reason for coming down from

Nashville today is because I feel -- I have

to step off topic, I'm not a chicken

farmer, I'm a chicken eater.

I believe the health care crisis will not be solved until we address ag policy and consumer preferences.

David Kessler, the former of head the FDA, says in his book, The End of Over Eating, it took 30 years to challenge and change the social stigma of cigarette smoking. He estimates that one-quarter of the population, 75 million Americans or more, are addicted to food. We need to

change this epidemic of obesity. It is 1 2 national security. 3 In this past decade life 4 expectancy dropped. The processed food 5 part of our western diet is shortening 6 lives. According to Michael Pollen food 7 8 use to be 18% of household expenses. It is now at 8 or 9%, thank God, but at what 9 10 price is this food so cheap. 11 Health care and health insurance, 12 in the same period, went from 10 to 18%. 13 Again, national security. 14 The medical term for the lost of 15 farmers is called a bleed out. One million 16 farmers is not safe, two million farmers is 17 safer. We need to grow more farmers. 18 If the trend continues to 19 urbanization, let's bring production to 20 urban areas. 21 Finally, on the subject of 22 justice, criminal, not civil penalties 23 should be applied to all polluters.

1 this should reach international law. 2 Thank you. 3 UNINDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I've been 4 in the chicken business some 15 years. 5 I've watched the chicken business and integrators evolve to a level that the 6 7 average farmer can no longer sustain a 8 living at, nor can we carry the rest as 9 we're asked to carry. 10 15 years ago growers only had a 11 7-year mortgage on new houses. Now, new 12 houses take 15 to 20 years to pay off with 13 very minimal base rate increase. 14 I don't know if these farmers are 15 able to pay off these houses. 16 I just want to tell my story. 17 There was a hundred and fifty growers 18 involved in a regional shut down. As we 19 was growers, we was ranked in the top big 20 bird division of Pilgrim Pride. 21 February 27th we got announcement 22 that our plant was going to be closed. 23 May all birds was gone. 600 houses sitting

1 empty. In those houses who's going to feed 2 our children? 3 I would say shut down with no 4 reflection to the growers and producers. 5 We were told by Pilgrim staff we was the best at what we did. Our community was 6 7 desiccated and most growers was heavily indebted, owe \$200,000. And we had growers 8 9 with new houses and with only three grow 10 outs. 11 900 jobs have been lost. Most of 12 our houses have been -- I mean cost of 13 upgrades. 14 Our local businesses are 15 suffering because of loss of income in 16 local economy. A hundred and six million 17 dollars jerked out of our economy. 18 All the equity each farm has 19 worked so hard to build overnight with our 20 house has turned into huge liabilities. 21 Paying insurance, taxes, no 22 birds. 23 Several -- several growers were

not able to survive with such a hit. And
the uncertainty of our future most of our
local farmers have managed to keep credit
with our local suppliers and banks.

Now, we are asked to restart this

Now, we are asked to restart this process and put our integrator's balance sheets back into the green.

This process of restarting our houses has costs us unnecessary thousands of dollars; however, we do have another chance now. Our plant we'll reopen.

Almost a year and a half has past. We will miss two years of income where the interest has not -- has stopped -- has not stopped accruing.

I do give Don Jackson, the CEO of Pilgrim's Pride, an enormous amount of credit. He managed to do the unthinkable by saving Pilgrim's Pride through one of the gloomiest times of financial ruin.

I would also like to take time to give our local and state leaders credit.

They worked with us around the clock and

1 our CEO to put a feasible plans together 2 which led to the reopening of our plant. 3 But the balance of my future is 4 still, and my grower friends, is in the 5 hands of Pilgrim's. I would like to ask a 6 series of questions that will hopefully 7 ensure such trying times never occur in my 8 lifetime, my son's lifetime or future 9 generations. 10 How can my fellow growers be 11 protected from such an event ever happening 12 again? 13 Should we be paid for down time 14 or should we get start up money? 15 We are a team, integrators and 16 growers and poultry workers, too. 17 Should we have longer contracts? 18 Should we have quaranteed loans 19 from integrators? 20 Now, you tell me the industry 21 needs, it just not one company's problem, 22 but it's the whole industry's problem that 23 needs fixing.

1 We thank you for your time. 2 And we thank you for the 3 opportunity to grow birds again on our 4 farms. 5 We hope the changes will make a 6 brighter future for all the growers and 7 integrators. We are one team. 8 What can you do for us growers? 9 We are the South Georgia Division 10 of Pilgrim's Pride, Douglas, Georgia, the 11 best of the best. MR. FERRELL: If our panelists 12 13 can come up to the table and we will get 14 started. 15 MR. FAMILANT: Hi everybody. Му 16 name is Norman Familant. I'm the Chief of 17 the Economic Section of the Antitrust 18 Division of Justice that works on most 19 agriculture matters. 20 And we're going to have a very 21 fast paced discussion among the panelists. 22 We're going to cover a lot of issues. 23 They're going to be many of the same issues that we've been discussing -- you've a been discussing so far today. That's no surprise because those are the issues on everybody's mind, but I think it will be interesting to -- to see -- to get the perspective of this panel.

During the -- during this panel we're going to -- we have a plan, we hope it will work. If you have questions, write them down on the index cards that were available when you came in and pass them off to the sides where many of the volunteers in the jackets and the outfits will collect them and bring them up.

I'll try to work them in. I
won't be able to work all of them. And I'm
not sure how much time we'll have left at
the end.

But the -- but, as you've been told before, there is an open testimony hour directly after us. So, hopefully, you can pose your question then.

Let me -- we -- we have a

very capable and interesting panel with a 1 2 -- from a very wide array of backgrounds. 3 And, so, let me introduce them. I believe 4 they're all in alphabetical order here. 5 Benny Bishop currently serves as 6 chief operations officer for Peco Foods in Tuscaloosa, Alabama. 7 He grew up on a poultry and row 8 9 crop farm. And is a graduate of 10 Jacksonville State University with a BS 11 degree in business administration. 12 Benny has worked full time in all 13 areas of the poultry industry for 40 years. 14 He has served on the Boards of 15 the Alabama Poultry Association, the 16 Arkansas Poultry Federation and is the past 17 president of the Mississippi Poultry Association. 18 19 Let's see. Sorry for -- because 20 we're in the order here. 21 Max Carnes runs the Carnes Farms 22 in Baldwin, Georgia. His growing business 23 started in 1977 when he built three houses.

1 He has grown that business to 16 houses 2 now. 3 That entire time he had 4 contracted with Fieldale Farms. 5 He's a graduate of the University 6 of Georgia. 7 He has two other business 8 interests. He's in the paving business and 9 on the Executive Committee of the Georgia 10 Highway Contractors Association of which he 11 is the past president. 12 He -- he also has an interest in 13 Zaxby's Food Operations in North Carolina, 14 but Zaxby's does not buy its broilers from 15 Fieldale Farms. 16 Let's see. Next we have 17 Professor Michael Dicks. Doctor Mike Dicks 18 was raised in rural Orange County, 19 California. He began his agricultural 20 career working in the vegetable fields and 21 the ranches of the Irvine Company. 22 He was active in FFA and Aq 23 Explorers.

1 He obtained degrees in 2 biochemistry and animal science from 3 California Polytechnic State University in 4 1975. 5 Doctor Dicks served in Kenya for three and a half years with the U. S. Peace 6 7 Corps. He obtained his Master's and his 8 9 Doctorate in agricultural economics, 10 specializing in natural resource policy, 11 from the University of Missouri. He has worked with USDA's 12 13 Economic Research Service in Washington, 14 D. C. 15 And is currently at Oklahoma 16 State University in the area of 17 agricultural policy. 18 Doctor Dicks has analyzed 19 contracts, production records and financial 20 information for hundreds of poultry growers 21 in eastern Oklahoma and western Arkansas. 22 And has measured the economic 23 impact of the poultry industry on a local,

1	regional and state economies. He has a
2	large number of professional publications.
3	He currently operates a hundred
4	head Angus cow calf operation.
5	And is a member of numerous
6	community, church and social organizations.
7	Number let's see sorry.
8	Next is John Ingrum.
9	John Ingrum is from Forest,
10	Mississippi. He's currently a poultry
11	grower for Cook Foods of Mississippi.
12	He also builds poultry
13	facilities.
14	He served 10 years in the U. S.
15	Army on active duty and six years with the
16	Scott County Sheriff's Department.
17	He also worked as a business
18	manager at Killian's Motors, Incorporated,
19	Forest, Mississippi, for 12 years.
20	Let's see. Next to him I'm
21	sorry for the shuffling around here is
22	Cindy Johnson.
23	Cindy Johnson had an early

exposure to the poultry industry and a grasp of how the industry works through her 3 father who has a PhD in poultry economics.

1

2

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

She majored in agriculture at the University of Georgia and graduated from the University of Georgia Law School in 1982.

After working in Valdosta for two years, Cindy moved with her husband and son to Dalton, Georgia.

She was offered a job as an appellate lawyer with the insurance defense firm of Kenny and Kim, where she remained for six years.

In June of 1990, she joined the law firm of Waycaster, Morris, Johnson and Since 1990, Cindy has represented Dean. hundreds of growers in state and federal courts and in pre-suit negotiated settlements.

In 2002, she left her former firm to join her husband in their practice in Cohutta, Georgia.

1 Next is Doctor Robert Taylor. 2 Professor Taylor is the Alpha 3 Distinguished University Professor in 4 Agricultural Economics and Public Policy of 5 the College of Agriculture at Auburn 6 University. 7 Prior to joining the Auburn faculty in 1988, he held faculty positions 8 9 at the University of Illinois, Texas A&M 10 University and Montana State University. 11 He had conducted applied research 12 on a wide variety of topics, including 13 market concentration, conservation, buyer 14 power and bio-energy. 15 He's authored or co-authored five books and over 200 articles -- and 200 16 17 articles and reports. 18 And has testified before Congress 19 on concentration and consolidation in the 20 food industry, particularly on issues in 21 the livestock and poultry industry. And, finally, is Mike Weaver. 22 23 Mike Weaver farms 350 acres in

244

Pendleton County, West Virginia. He raises 1 2 Angus beef cattle as well as broilers -- as 3 well as broilers for Pilgrim's Pride that 4 are processed at the Morefield, West 5 Virginia processing plant. 6 He started in the poultry 7 business with turkeys and switched to broilers about six years ago. 8 9 His broiler facility is comprised 10 of two houses with 94,000 birds per flock. 11 Mike is president of the Contract 12 Poultry Growers Association of the 13 Virginias. 14 He is a retired Special Agent for 15 the U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service. 16 He served as a board member of t 17 he Allegheny -- Allegheny Highland 18 Alliance, the West Virginia Special 19 Olympics Program, the Potomac Highlands 20 Wounded Warrior Outreach and Roritan 21 National. 22 So let's go right away to our --23 to my first question area. And -- and I'm

1 going to turn to some -- I'm going to turn 2 to specific panelists for the first 3 responses for all of these question areas. 4 Number one, in addressing our 5 trends in poultry panel topic, we first 6 seemed to gain some insight into key 7 changes in poultry production and marketing 8 over the past decade. 9 What changes have occurred in the 10 typical initial investment in the scale of 11 an efficient operation and the time 12 required for each flock to reach maturity? 13 What do we know about the 14 quantity and quality of poultry produced 15 over the last decade and the importance of 16 exports? 17 And I'll, of course, turn to 18 Professor Dicks. 19 MR. DICKS: Thanks, Norman. 20 It's great to be here and thank 21 y'all for coming. 22 It is a great country that we can 23 all come and voice our opinions and be

1 heard. And I hope that we -- we all are 2 heard respectfully. 3 Even -- even university 4 presidents -- university faculty aren't --5 aren't immune to being victimized or hurt, intimidated. 6 7 Even this morning I've had groups call my dean and call my president of the 8 9 university asking for background 10 information and paperwork, Freedom of Information Act to try to get me to cease 11 my participation in these hearings. 12 13 So those that know me know that I 14 am un-intimidated. 15 Let me -- let me start by giving 16 a few recent changes that, I think, are 17 important just to give -- to give a 18 perspective on the industry. 19

First of all, we -- we -- most of know that the new top cool cell house has largely been adopted by the industry by this time. It's more efficient than the others ones, particularly in terms of

20

21

22

23

energy efficiency, which has been a 1 2 tremendous help to the growers, although 3 that it is a much more expensive facility. Sometimes -- the last estimates I 4 have on that was from 2007, 2008. 5 houses are about \$225,000, which would 6 7 include all the equipment necessary to run That's a fairly substantial 8 them. investment for one of those houses. 9 10 And I'm -- I'm saying the typical 11 house is 40 feet by 400 feet. 12 Every farm size has increased. 13 We now -- in my area we're looking at about 14 three houses is the average farm size. 15 think a decade ago that was probably two 16 houses. 17 The average market age of 18 broilers is 47 days, the same as it was 19 about 20 years ago. 20 The average bird today is heavier 21 than it was ten years ago. It's now about 22 5.63 pounds compared to about five -- five

23

pounds in 2000.

Feed efficiency has increased, 1 2 slightly, but that slight increase is a 3 tremendous gain in terms of profitability. 4 It's gone from 1.92 pounds to 1. -- sorry, 5 from 1.95 to 1.92 pounds. 6 On -- on farm mortality rate 7 dropped from 5% to 4.1%, which is -- which is fairly substantial. 8 9 And if -- you know, for a cow cow 10 operator to get below 5% would be -- would 11 be a real -- a real thrill. 12 Post-mortem condemnation rates 13 have dropped from 1.22% to .87% in 2009. 14 And, again, that -- that has some real 15 profit potential. 16 And then the last thing is on 17 that trend is that per capita consumption 18 of poultry continues to increase from about 19 80 at the start of decade to almost 90 20 today. So those are the, I think, the 21 22 things that would indicate improvement in

the industry, more profitability, more

23

1 efficiency.

On the other hand there's some things of a wider nature that I think are important for all us to think about. It's being interesting listening to all problems today. And believe me, those things didn't fall short on me. I am sensitive to agriculture producers. I -- I spend a great deal of my time -- I -- I am an agriculture producer. I'm probably out in the countryside. I give 50 to 60 extension presentations a year. And I -- and I do a lot of work with producers.

So hearing your stories, I assure that I listen very intently to those stories. They're not much different than the stories I hear from cattle producers, swine producers, wheat producers, corn producers, et cetera.

While the trends that I've told you indicate that there is an increase in productivity and efficiency, these other major trends that I think are -- are

exceedingly important. And one -- and the things that I think you really need to think about.

And I'm sorry that Mr. Vilsack has left because some of these fall on his doorstep as we heard this morning.

One of the things that's created some of the problems in the industry is -- is -- started in 1994 with the reorganization of USDA. When USDA was reorganized, they took Farmer's Home Administration and stuck into Farms Service Agency. Then FSA.

That reduced the staff and also made changes in each one of those offices. And that trend has continued. The total number employes in the FSA -- in the local FSA office has -- has dwindled, as well as the number of FSA offices.

And that means there's less people to service those loans and to look and see if those loans are -- are worthy of being delivered.

Also, as you all know, we're in a financial situation in this country and the world. And a lot of that has to do with cheap and easy credit policies, not only from the federal government and the Federal Reserve, but on down to the local banks.

And I think that's had a tremendous impact on what you're seeing in the industry today.

One of -- one of the largest problems I see and I've commented on this before the Senate Ag Committee in 1997, was the Federal Agricultural Improvement Reform Act in 1996. That -- that farm bill, as most people call it, the Farm Bill of 1996, eliminated -- essentially eliminated farm storage programs.

And from that time on the government virtually had no more commodity storage programs. And I insisted at that time -- because yields in the country are increasing at a decreasing rate and becoming increasingly more variable while

demand continues to increase, at some point
that means we're going to have price
spikes.

And if you'll go back and read my testimony, I said that within a decade when I was asked how long it would be, I said within a decade we'd see some major price spikes in commodities.

And I missed it by a year. It was 2008 not 2007. So I missed it by a year, but it is there and it's going to happen again.

And some of the problems that you're facing today and that are coming down on the integrators are because we have gotten rid of commodity policy and we're not -- we're not managing supplies any longer.

And, so, we're going to see much more variation in -- in feed -- feed prices. Much more volatility and probably a continuing trend upward in those prices.

So, I think, you know, again,

those are -- that's a -- that's a major policy we're about to revisit. The current farm bill is probably one of the most complicated instruments that I've had a chance to deal with. And I've been doing it for a long time. I know Bob might want to contact -- comment on that himself.

I think also reaching people in the last couple of years, meaning the total amount of oil that's all out, is never going to get greater. And -- and we have no energy policy. That's had a tremendous impact.

I don't know how many people have said that today, that those rising propane prices and rising electricity prices are squeezing profits. That's certainly the case.

If you enter into a contract in 2004 for a set price, your propane price between 2004 and 2009 went up from roughly on the retail price for the nation a dollar a gallon to two and a half dollars a

1 gallon. Now, that's a tremendous squeeze 2 on profit. And most people did have a 3 profitability to warrant that increase. That's something, again, that --4 that falls back in the lap of Congress and 5 6 the federal government is coming up with 7 that energy policy. 8 Finally, just one last thing. 9 want to make sure that before I -- before I 10 get done that today I want to -- I want to 11

talk about this financial performance sector. That's one thing that hasn't changed.

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

You know there is, and I've heard a lot of that today. There is one thing that is common is agriculture, and I know you've all heard this. There's an idiom that come from 50 years ago I heard when I was a kid, "Cash poor and asset rich".

And that literally means I've got great profitability, which the U.S. Agriculture sector does. Your --your industry, your -- you growers, most

agriculture groups in this country have a 1 2 very high profitability. I'll explain that 3 if you'd like. But you have a very low 4 dollar sales per amount of fixed assets you 5 And that causes you to have a low 6 return on investment. 7 And essentially what I'm telling 8 you is, you're making good money, but 9 you're using it all to pay for your assets. 10 And I think you know that. That's true for 11 every part of agriculture. 12 MR. FAMILANT: Some follow-up 13 comments from Max Carnes. 14 MR. CARNES: I'll give a short 15 one. Thank you. Going back -- we started 16 our family in 1977. And, at that time, we 17 built three houses for about \$26,000 each. 18 The last houses that we built 19 were 500 by 50. And they're approximately 20 a hundred and seventy-five or 225,000. I can't remember which now. 21 22 But going back over some of the 23 changes that we have seen through the

years. When we started out we had the old time eight foot drinkers that you would slosh out or rub out with your brush and whatnot.

And, of course, now we've gone to the nipple drinker that's a lot more efficient and a lot easier to operate.

Our lighting program has changed dramatically. And to begin we had 24 hours of daylight. And now we manipulate it for the different size birds that we want. And we -- we've gone from an incandescent bulb to a fluorescent bulb and back to an incandescent. And that will probably change again, too.

Also, when we first started, we had the regular pancake brooders in the middle of the house. And then that has changed to a forced air heater on the side of the house. And that has gone back now. We have a combination of the brooders and the forced air heaters.

Of course, a cool cell is one

thing that I think has helped us more than anything else in the world.

To be able to cool the birds, I know always before when the chickens got about 93 degrees you might as well -- or the inside temperature got to be 93 degrees, you might as well plan on start picking up some dead birds.

That has been, I think, the biggest innovation that -- that we have had since I've been growing chickens.

Also, now, we have the computers that control everything in the house, which makes everyone's job a whole lot easier.

It's just a -- a -- a big, big help to have that temperature change so minutely so that everything works out well.

The other thing that we have changed in our houses, when we first built our houses we had posts in the house. All of those have been changed now and we have all clear span houses.

So we have seen tremendous amount

1	of innovations in the in the farming
2	industry. And it has been a big help.
3	It's it's made our jobs a lot easier,
4	but you still have to pick up those dead
5	chickens. I can't fix that for you.
6	Thank you.
7	MR. FAMILANT: Any any brief,
8	follow-up comments by any of our panelists?
9	On this question, yeah.
10	Everybody okay?
11	Let's go to question two. Let's
12	get to the contracts.
13	We'll deal with the compensation
14	aspects, that is, the tournament ranking
15	system and requirements for improvements in
16	additional investments and the two
17	questions that follow this one.
18	But, first, let's address the
19	basics, although there surely is variation
20	in the contracts, what are the key
21	non-compensation terms in the contract with
22	which you are familiar?
23	What's typical what's the

typical term of the contract? 1 2 When there is concentration --3 when there is -- excuse me. When there is a contraction in 4 5 the market, do the integrators cut back on 6 the frequency of flocks in the contracts, 7 or do they cut back on the number of chicks 8 placed? 9 And I'm going to ask Mr. Bishop. 10 MR. BISHOP: Thank you for the 11 opportunity to be here and speaking on 12 behalf of my company Peco Foods, and also 13 on behalf of the poultry industry. 14 The key non-compensation terms 15 that we have in our current contract, of 16 which I'm most familiar with, there's a --17 or are a long list of these things. 18 But, first all, we've got to 19 consider the terms of broiler contracts. 20 And it's important to keep them in 21 perspective the nature of a processor's 22 business. And my company is the same way.

First of all, all us, as poultry

23

processors, are producing chicken products for, not only the U. S. food supply, but also a global market.

It's critical these products be wholesome.

And, second of all, we have customers and markets out there that demand a specific sized bird and a uniformed bird. We can't just arbitrarily go out and grow any kind -- any size bird, any kind of bird we want to, we have to have something to market.

Processors and our customers rely on hundreds of growers to help us grow these various type birds and various sizes.

The chicks that we own, of course, as processors, are entrusted to growers. They have to properly care for them, not only from a cost competitive standpoint, but also from an animal welfare standpoint. We all depend on these animals for our very existence.

You talk about non-compensation

terms of contracts, first of all, the processor provides chicks, feed and medication.

The processor also provides management guidelines and technical service support.

The grower provides housing, equipment, labor and utilities to care for these chicks and grow them to the proper weight.

The contract prohibits the grower from having other fowl on the farm and prohibits the growers -- grower from using any other type feed, rodenticides pesticides, insecticides, feticides, any kind of medication that's not provided by the company or the processor or approved by the processor.

The processor is looking for that grower's individual skills and experience on that farm. We contract with them. And any successor or reassignment of that contract unless approved by the processor.

1 The processor is also given the 2 right to access on the grower's farm for 3 the purpose of inspecting the flock and the 4 grower's operations. 5 The contract generally provides that a grower is an independent contractor 6 7 and not an employee of the grower or the 8 company -- the processor or the company. 9 Any veterinarian's reports 10 considering -- concerning flock health is 11 also available to the grower upon request. 12 The processor agrees to pay for 13 damage on the farm caused by his employees. 14 Feed and live birds are to be 15 weighed by bonded weigh masters. 16 Feed trailers will be sealed if 17 requested by the grower. Growers have a right to be a 18 19 member of and participate in any 20 organization or association they choose. 21 The contract generally has 22 default provisions with an opportunity to 23 cure, in except in circumstances where

there is serious violations that might 1 2 threaten the processor's property, the live birds or the processor's employees. 3 4 The second part of the question, 5 what's a typical term of the contract. 6 can only speak for our company. And I'm 7 sure it varies throughout the industry. But the terms of our contracts at 8 9 Peco are from flock-to-flock up to 15 years 10 and anywhere in between. 11 Our new house contracts are 15 12 years. 13 Contracts on older farms, depend 14 on the age and condition of houses, and, 15 also, some circumstances surrounding those 16 houses. 17 Some lending agencies that finance some of our farms dictate the lien 18 19 or the terms of the contract and we abide 20 by those. 21 We currently grow in houses that 22 age from brand new to 40 years old. 23 The average age of our 1570

1 houses is 15 years is old.

Our company has been in business for 73 years. And in the last 10 years we've had 749 contracts. We've terminated 3% of those contracts for just cause.

The last -- the third question, when there's contrast in the market, do processors cut back on the frequency of flocks and contracts are then cut back on numbers of chicks.

Again, I can only speak for our company. During the recent severe market contractions, and there have been a few in the last several years, Peco Foods has attempted to manage through these contractions by simply cutting back the frequency of flocks grown. That's the only thing we have done.

In an effort to mitigate the impact of these contractions on our growers, we've offered an increased out time pay to help the growers' cash flow.

As a result of this action, our

1 company, rather than the grower, has borne 2 the principle brunt of these market 3 contractions. 4 Thank you. 5 MR. FAMILANT: Mike Weaver. MR. WEAVER: 6 There's several 7 different aspect of contracts that directly 8 affect growers. And I'm going to try to 9 address those here. 10 They're talking about these 11 non-compensation aspects of the contract. 12 Probably one of the most significant for us 13 as growers is the term of the contract. 14 believe Mr. Bishop here says that theirs 15 flock-to-flock. 16 And, as a general rule, from what 17 I've seen, and I've seen many contracts 18 from many different companies around the 19 country, flock-to-flock is about a 20 standard. 21 You may see on your contract, 22 I've had one myself in the past, where it 23 says the term of the contract is five years

or ten years or 15, but in reality, that --1 2 that contract is flock-to-flock. 3 And because it also goes on to 4 give the company the authority to terminate 5 that contract with or without cause. So it 6 may vary a little bit on that, too. 7 Some of them say, however, some 8 of them say with cause, some of them say 9 with or without cause. 10 One of the biggest problems I 11 think with the poultry contracts instrument 12 is no input from the growers. We have no 13 say so whatsoever in that contract. 14 As -- as all you growers know 15 here, and I -- Mr. Bishop's company might 16 be different, I don't know, but I hope it 17 si, but they are more or less take it or 18 leave it contracts. 19 When they bring it to you, you 20 sign it, you grow chickens, you don't, you 21 don't grow chickens. 22 There's termination requirements

or stipulations in those contracts. As I

23

just mentioned, capital investment requirements, which never use to be listed, but now, thankfully, under the 2008 Farm Aid Bill that has to be included in the contract. All it does, though, is tell you that you may be required to make capital investments. It doesn't say how much it's going to cost you, how long it's going to take you to pay it back or how much money in addition they're going to give you to pay you for making those capital improvements.

One of the -- one of the real problems with the contracts is, and I expect most of the growers that are here have experienced this is, that it's only a contract until they bring you the next one, you know.

It might say 15 years, but two months from now they might decide to change that contract. So they bring you a new one and you sign it or you don't grow chicks, you know. To me, that's not a contract.

We also have no control over the age they take the bird for processing, it's up to the company. It's their -- in my case -- in my case, I grow a four pound bird. And recently they've been taking our birds as early as 34 days. We're lucky to get a three and a half pound chicken in that amount of time.

And that loss of that weight, we don't get paid for it, is our loss. They don't get -- that doesn't made up to us in anyway whatsoever.

We have -- we have no say so in the number of breeder chickens. It says specifically in the contract that that -- the number of birds they place on your farm it's up to them. And you have nothing to say about it.

So if they bring you 10,000 chickens or they bring you 2,000 chickens, it's completely up to the company.

The transferability in that contract, we have no input into.

If I decide to sell my farm and I have somebody wants to buy my farms, I can't transfer that contract to them without the approval of the company. In reality, that company has a new -- or negotiates a new contract with that person.

And that's -- the requirement for upgrades has become a real problem as far as any growers that want to try to sell their farm because somehow the company has figured out that if they want to force somebody to make upgrades on their farm that they're trying to sell, they'll -- they either make those upgrades themselves at their expense so that they can sell their farm or the person that buys the farms is forced to make those upgrades. And I think that's absolutely wrong.

In my particular case under the 2008 Farm Bill we were given the right to opt out of binding arbitration, which is a

wonderful thing, and I hope nobody in here 1 2 agrees to binding arbitration, you 3 shouldn't. If you do, you need to talk to 4 your attorney about that. 5 But we -- my company restricted 6 me, even though I can opt out of binding 7 arbitration, from a jury trial. It says my only right is through a trial in front of a 8 9 judge. 10 So I got out of binding 11 arbitration, but now I can't even go before 12 a judge. And I thought this was America. 13 I thought we are able -- we were all 14 entitled to a jury -- a trial by jury, but 15 under my contract, I'm not. 16 MR. FAMILANT: Any other quick --17 quick comments before we move on? 18 I'd like to MR. TAYLOR: 19 emphasize one point Mike made. 20 In recent years contracts are 21 going for longer and longer periods. There 22 are 3-year contracts and seven and some

23

ten.

1	15-year contract mentioned, I
2	have yet to see a multi year contract that
3	required the integrator to provide more
4	than one flock of chicks. It could be for
5	a thousand years, it doesn't matter.
6	You're guaranteed one flock of chicks.
7	And then after that the
8	integrator can change the contract or
9	whatever. That's what economists called
10	hold it up can occur. I have not seen
11	Peco's contract, but all of the others I've
12	seen.
13	MR. FAMILANT: We should turn now
14	to the key compensation aspect of the
15	contracts that determine the ranking
16	system.
17	First, let's get a brief
18	description of a typical payment scheme.
19	When did this compensation aspect
20	of the contracts emerge?
21	When when did we get terms?
22	And why do you think these
23	emerged?

1 And this last question is 2 particularly of interest to me as an 3 economist, why do we observe it so 4 universally in broilers, but not so in 5 raising other animals? And I'm going to turn John 6 7 Ingrum. 8 MR. INGRUM: And, first of all, I 9 want to thank everybody for being here 10 today. I've grown poultry for ten years. 11 And the problem I see in the 12 ranking system is it's not fair. And 13 there's no way it could be fair, you know. 14 A lot of the growers will tell 15 you that the companies tell you that the 16 ranking system is a fair way of judging the 17 grower on their performance, but there's no 18 way it could be -- it could be fair because 19 we don't have any control over the birds 20 they bring us. 21 Sometime's I've -- I've dumped 22 chickens that -- you know, there's a 23 hundred chickens in a tray. And I've

1 dumped the chickens where's there 35 to 40 2 of those chickens dead in that tray. 3 So -- and I -- and, also, one of 4 the growers said earlier I have been out of 5 feed for two or three days with six-week old chicklets. 6 7 And it's based on the breeder 8 chickens you get or whether they're male or 9 female. 10 And it also is based on how long 11 you out of chickens. If you're out of 12 chickens 14 days, and you're out of 13 chickens 21 days, that has an effect on how 14 your chickens are going to be perform based 15 on your litter quality. 16 So I don't -- I don't see how the 17 ranking system could ever be a fair system, 18 you know. 19 The poultry industry has really 20 been strange to me because I have a son 21 that's a computer expert. And we use to

try to figure out how to come up with our

feed conversions on -- based on what our

22

23

1 chickens should weigh.

This kid is a master on a computer, never could figure out the chicken business, never could figure out the feed. And, so, I knew then that it was something wrong.

But, as far as a ranking system, there's -- there's no way it could be fair.

And to base our performance if -if the company -- I was out of feed one
time as long as three days when my chickens
started to eat on each other, but when I
sold those chickens they still based my
performance on what I done, but I had no
control over the feed that they brought me.
So there's no way that the ranking system
could ever be fair. That's in my opinion.

MR. FAMILANT: Professor Taylor, any follow-up on this?

MR. TAYLOR: Well, you question about why is that in the poultry industry and not others, is simply because the integrators require it. They set it up

1 that way.

There's the myth that this system takes grower -- eliminates grower's risk.

It doesn't. It actually -- the common pay system -- if you have a high cost, you get a low unit price, or if you have a low cost, you get a high unit price. And it doubly penalizes or doubly rewards growers for good or bad flocks.

A very troubling aspect is a grower cannot verify any of the numbers used to calculate pay.

The second thing is beef quality varies, chick quality varies, economists call this pay system a tournament, to me it's a lottery.

And the problem is, it can be a rigged lottery, I'm not saying it is a rigged lottery, but it can be and a grower has no way of figuring out if they were singled out for good chicks or if they had a sweetheart deal and were singled out for really good feed and really good chicks.

1	So it's a very troubling aspect
2	that a grower cannot verify the numbers
3	used to compute their pay.
4	MR. FAMILANT: I've seen some
5	discussion that we're we're beginning to
6	see tournaments in some other animals.
7	Have have are you
8	familiar with any evidence of that?
9	MR. TAYLOR: Not like the poultry
10	system.
11	MR. WEAVER: I have a comment on
12	this.
13	MR. FAMILANT: Sure.
14	MR. WEAVER: There's stop and
15	think about this my fellow growers.
16	Under the ranking system if
17	you're provided with poor poor quality
18	chicks and poor quality feed, which is an
19	input from the company that we have no
20	control over, you're going to have poor
21	production.
22	This means you're going to have
23	

inputs from that company. So you're going 1 2 to lose money on the weight that you don't 3 have. 4 Plus, under the ranking system, you're going to have points deducted from 5 6 your pay because you -- you produced 7 poorly. 8 So under the ranking system we 9 get hit twice, we get subtracted on twice. 10 And there's no way that that is fair. 11 Another way that it's not fair is 12 the fact that it robs Peter to pay Paul. 13 Why should it be fair for -- for the 14 companies to be allowed take money away 15 from you to give it to me because I did 16 better than you did. There's no way that 17 could be fair and it shouldn't be legal. 18 We've -- we've got to have a 19 better system of paying our growers here in 20 the United States. 21 MR. FAMILANT: Mr. Taylor, what's 22 the problem? 23 MR. TAYLOR: Let me mention one

1	thing I've observed about the tournament
2	pay system. There are a lot of subtlies
3	dealing with whether an average is used or
4	whether a median is used or whether a
5	weighted average is used. And the
6	integrators exclude some flocks, sometimes
7	high, sometimes low. They completely
8	determine what is excluded. They have mini
9	and max pay.
10	The point I'm getting up is, in
11	contracts, most of them have a stated based
12	a contract pay. Let's say it's five cents.
13	And there are bonuses for those that really
14	have good flocks about that and penalties
15	for those below.
16	For the base pay of five cents,
17	if you take a weighted average of all of
18	those for flocks, it usually comes out to
19	be less than what a contract says. And to
20	me, that's deceptive and unfair.
21	MR. FAMILANT: Benny Bishop.
22	MR. BISHOP: I just wanted to

make the comment, there's been some

comments talked about poor chick quality,
poor feed quality.

And, first of all, you know, from the company's standpoint, it's not in the best interest of any company in this business, and, again, I'm speaking for our company, but for the industry as a whole, to send out poor quality chicks and bad feed to any grower. I'll say that to anybody in this room or in this industry.

And if you look at what's happened in the industry over the last ten years, we've improved livability by over 1%. Back in 1999 and 2000 the average livability was only 95%.

Today 2009, 2010, we've raised that livability to 96% plus.

USDA records show that whole birds condemns are over 1%. Ten years ago 1.2, 1.3. Today, the last 12 months, the average whole bird condemned is less than one-third of one percent.

And the industry does not achieve

1	this with poor quality chicks and poor
2	birds coming off the farm.
3	MR. WEAVER: I'd like to make
4	another comment about that if I could.
5	MR. FAMILANT: Go ahead.
6	MR. WEAVER: The reason industry
7	is allowed is able to achieve that is
8	because of good growers.
9	MR. BISHOP: But there's some
10	good inputs, they're not all poor.
11	MR. DICKS: If I could just make
12	a couple of comments.
13	MR. FAMILANT: Go ahead.
14	MR. DICKS: You know, you asked
15	about the you know, I grew up in the
16	tomato industry. And I can tell you that
17	they have the same kind of a tournament
18	system basically in the tomato industry in
19	terms of providing those tomatoes to the
20	to the processor. And that's what we did.
21	And you're you're paid based
22	on how much sun scald there is; how much
23	rot there is; how much different than if

it's less than -- if it's more than 12%, 2 they turn the whole tub back around, 40 something tons of tomatoes, and back to the 4 fields and you get to dump them. So it's the same kind of deal, but a little harsher.

1

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

In the beef industry I'm pretty glad that we've gone to the grid system. Ι get paid, not only the quality of my carcass, but the yield of my carcass in terms of also the rib eye, the back fat, all kinds of characteristics on that. So, again, there is -- there is something to the merit system.

And I want to follow-up on what Benny says. You know, one of the things for me, as an economist, is try to figure out why things are the way they are.

And just so you understand, you know, I don't want to put a lot into all the nuisances of these -- of these -- of this tournament system. And I know there's lot of ways it could be improved probably

and they're probably some things wrong with it, but -- but let's look at why it's happening.

First of all, the -- the integrators don't make a large profit.

That's a lot -- you know, a lot of -- but here's what I want to tell you. And I know you're all rolling your eyes about that.

If you take the cash sales and divided by the cash expenses or, sorry, you take the cash sales and minus the cash expenses and divide by the cash sales, that's profit, okay. That's not return on assets.

These -- these integrators are making 1 to 2% profit. The thing that they're -- the way they're making returns their return on assets is by lots of quantity.

What they have to do is run those plants at a hundred percent capacity. They cannot afford to produce chicks and not have those chicks come back live and as big

1 as they can.

And, so, what they're doing is they're reimbursing those growers to try to induce the biggest birds they can get in the most efficient production. Now, that just makes sense. So that's what -- that's what that whole tournament process is.

Now, I want to -- the reason I'm saying this is because if you have a better way, right, of -- of -- of -- of coming up with a formula -- and you're in the business -- I always tell farmers that, you're in the business, you're on the ground, if you have a better way of coming up -- a way of paying yourself for being efficient, bring it forward, bring it forward, let's talk about it. Maybe -- maybe that's what the industry go to.

MR. WEAVER: I have a suggestion for that. If you don't mind, I'd like take a couple a minutes here.

MR. FAMILANT: We have talked -- we've got to move along. So just try to do

1 it real quickly in 30 seconds.

MR. WEAVER: Well, okay, plain and simple. What we need is a base pay, a true base pay for growers that can't be subtracted. Once we get that, we'll be in a position to where we know what our pay is going to be at least. And the companies won't be at their will to take away from us when they want to.

If we -- we have a set amount that we know we're going to receive, we can budget ourselves and operate on that.

And it has to be an amount that allows us to pay our bills and make it a reasonable amount of return.

MR. FAMILANT: Okay. As -- as I suggested earlier, we also want to address another aspect of the contract, situations in which integrators require upgrades and additional investments by growers in order to perform their contracts.

How often does this occur?
What do the processors cite as

1	the reason for these demands they make?
2	What is the evidence on whether
3	these upgrades lead to cost effective
4	improvements in the quantity and quality of
5	poultry grown to maturity?
6	And what is the effect on the
7	growers?
8	So we'll turn to Mr. Weaver
9	first.
10	MR. WEAVER: Just to go down the
11	list there.
12	The first one is, how often does
13	this occur, that varies tremendously.
14	You-all know that as well as I do.
15	But, as a general rule, major
16	upgrades are pretty much on the five to
17	10-year cycle. It depends on how old your
18	houses are and the whim of the integrators
19	essentially is what what it comes to.
20	Integrators I I it says
21	processors. And I'm assuming you mean all
22	integrators?
23	MR. FAMILANT: Yes.

1 MR. WEAVER: The reasons for 2 these demands as typically can improve 3 production, but one of the problems with it 4 is they never delineate who the -- who the 5 improved production is going to be, is it 6 going to be for them or is it going to be 7 for us as growers, but we're the ones who have to bear the cost for it. And that's 8 9 -- that's the true problem that I see. 10 The integrators don't bear any of 11 that cost typically. Now, sometimes they do cost share a little bit. 12 13 One good example I can give you 14 is one of our growers was forced to do 15 \$600,000 in upgrades in his poultry 16 operation and they cost shared with him. They gave him \$78,000. So that was a 17 really big cost share, wasn't it? 18 19 AUDIENCE: Good return on 20 investment. 21 MR. WEAVER: Yeah, that's right. 22 Another thing they don't do is 23 give us a cost projection on how this is

going to help us, you know.

I would -- I would -- if they could -- if they could -- if they could come to me and say we want you to make this hundred thousand dollar improvement. And here's a cost projection as to how you're going to get paid back for that, and here's how much increase we're going to give you, and it take you this amount time to make this back, if they could show that to me in black and white and make it reasonable, I'd agree to do it, they wouldn't have to force me.

And that -- it should tell
everybody who -- who even pays any
attention to that situation at all, and
you-all have heard it all day in here, if
they bring that contract to you with that
upgrade in it and tell you if don't sign
it, you're going to get -- you're not going
to get chickens, well, that's forcing
people to do it, isn't it?

But if they came to me and showed

me this cost projection and said we're
going to pay you this much more. And we
can prove to you that this improvement is
going to make you this much more money and
here's how long it will take you to get it
back, I'd gladly do it, but that never
happens.

What's the evidence on whether these upgrades lead to cost effective improvements and quantity and quality of poultry growth, from what I've seen there's very little evidence.

You-all know, as well I do, that at times it's just the whim of the integrator. We all have our opinions as to why they force us to do them upgrades and go into additional debt.

A lot times there is just speculation on the part of the companies.

Like I said, if they brought -brought me a spread sheet and showed me
this is how much it's going to cost you and
this is how long it's going to take you to

get your -- recoup your investment, it would be a whole lot easier for me to make a decision on whether I do that or not, but 4 the way it is, my decision is not too hard anyway because they can come to me and say, "If you don't do this, you're not going to 7 get chickens".

1

2

3

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

And that's -- like I said earlier, this is the United States of America, I don't think we should have to suffer through that.

Where they're asking us to take on additional debt for these improvements that -- that many times is not funded. even when they do give us an increase for it, it doesn't' cash flow, there's no way to pay for itself.

More times than not these improvements that they force us to do benefits the integrator 100%, or at least a whole lot more than it does the growers that are being forced to make these upgrades.

1 So I think we need to encourage packers and stockyards to create some 2 3 regulations saying that the poultry 4 companies have upgrades they'd like to 5 make, if they think it's worth it to them 6 and their production is going to increase 7 that much, they should pay for it. MR. FAMILANT: Cindy Johnson. 8 9 MS. JOHNSON: Thank you. I guess 10 you folks were starting to wonder whether I 11 was going to talk today or not. 12 I'm Cindy Johnson. And I'm kind of the token lawyer, maybe the token woman 13 14 on this panel. 15 I'm humbled, I'm honored to be 16 here today. I want to, first of all, thank 17 whoever turned the air-conditioner off 18 because I thought I was going to have to 19 chatter through this. 20 And I also want to thank 21 especially my husband and my law partner 22 publicly, for having traveled down this

road representing chicken farmers for a

1 very long time with me at great risk to our 2 family. Thank you, Honey, I love you. 3 I was talking to our 24-year old daughter back a few weeks ago because I was 4 5 trying to remember how long I've been doing this. 6 And I said, "Elsa, how long have 7 8 I been representing these chicken growers? It seems like forever". 9 10 She said, "Momma, I don't know". She said, "All I know is when I 11 12 was little girl I used to think that 13 ConAgra must be a very bad man". 14 So it's been a long time, but 15 I'll get to upgrades. 16 Back in the '90's I was assisting 17 some other attorneys and some people that 18 were active in the industry trying to 19 organize poultry growers in the State of 20 Georgia. And I went to a lot of meetings 21 and did hearings around the state. 22 And one of the things that always 23 came up was upgrades and how the companies,

the integrators would keep growers in debt
with upgrades.

And that's the same song and dance I hear today when -- from these growers is we just can't get out of debt for the upgrades.

From a legal perspective, as a lawyer, it's always puzzled me that the chicken processing companies call poultry growers independent contractors and at the same time control the manner and the method of how they grow chickens.

The legal definition of an independent contractor in the State of Georgia is by definition, "Being able to control the manner or method of how you produce a result".

If the integrators want to experiment with new technology, they should do that at that their own expense, not at the expense of the grower.

If -- if a grower is growing as good a chicken as the man down the road

with the fancy new equipment at the same

cost to the company as the guy with the new

fancy new equipment, why should he have to

go and get into a lot more debt to put in

the fancy, new equipment when it's not

going to result in any additional money to

him. I don't understand.

And I think it's a symptom of the problem we have with the lack of power in growers who have invested more than half of the capital in chickens in this country collectively.

And there's a problem when you have a group of people who have invested more than half the capital in chickens and have no power and no say and get as little money as they do compared to the profits of the processors.

MR. FAMILANT: John Ingrum.

MR. INGRUM: It always puzzled me the word upgrade, upgrade to what.

I have a -- my farm is down the street from another quy. And his farm is

probably 35 years old and my farm is 15. 1 2 And this guy repeatedly beat me every batch 3 after batch after batch. Me and him was 4 good friends. I go down there to try find out what he was doing differently for me, 5 but his houses was older than mine. 6 7 And my serviceman came out one day and he said, "We're going to close so 8 and so down the road down". 9 10 And I said, "Why"? He said, "Well, his houses is too 11 12 old". I said, "Too old"? 13 14 This guy is kicking my butt month 15 after -- batch after batch. I mean, that 16 shouldn't have nothing to do with how old 17 his houses is. And they ended up putting 18 him out of business, closing him down. 19 Then I had another friend. 20 had \$600,000 he owed on his farm. He had a 21 10 house farm. And he had to do upgrades. 22 When he got through upgrading on 23 that ten house farm he owed 1.2 million

МУ

1 dollars on a farm that was 15 years old. 2 He upgraded his self slap out of business. 3 He ended up -- he couldn't -- when he'd 4 make a chick it ended up costing him money 5 to grow chickens. He simply walked away. 6 You know who suffered, SBA, 7 because the SBA quaranteed his loan to get 8 that upgrade. And then I had another friend --9 10 there was four brothers in chicken 11 business. And they upgraded and upgraded 12 and upgraded to where these guys owe a 13 million dollars on a farm that's 15 to 14 20 years old. 15 When -- I mean, when do the 16 upgrades get to the point to where we don't 17 upgrade to the standard? It's -- we only 18 upgrade to the -- to the point of our 19 service tech because every service tech 20 that comes requires us to do different 21 things. 22 I had to put lights down the

center of my chicken house, half house.

service tech said, "I want these lights 1 2 down to make it brighter, the chickens will 3 do better". 4 I said, "Okay". 5 Did it. It wasn't very much expense, \$1500. 6 7 The next service -- this guy was 8 only there three or four months. 9 The next service tech came out 10 and says, "Why did you put them lights only 11 half way down that chicken house"? 12 I said, "Well, because the guy 13 told me before to do it". 14 He said, "Well, you know, I don't 15 like that, I want them all the way down the chicken house". 16 17 And then I had another service 18 tech after that, it's about six months 19 after that, because, you know, they rotates 20 them around to keep you from jumping on them. 21 22 And he came out and he -- I mean 23 -- I -- I work on poultry houses. So I had

my stuff in order. 1 2 So he comes out and he's looking 3 up in the air because they don't really 4 need -- they was trying to figure out a way 5 to extend my out time because they really didn't need me to be in rotation at that 6 7 time. 8 So he was looking up in the air. 9 And I said, "Hey, the chickens 10 are down here, tell me what the problem 11 is". 12 He said, "Do you see that power 13 line up there"? 14 I said, "Yes". 15 He said, "I want that down". I said, "Well, I'm sorry, Bud, 16 17 but that belongs to Mississippi Power. I don't have no control over that". 18 19 And he says, "You're not getting 20 chickens until you take that line down 21 because our feed trucks might hit it". 22 Well, my feed bins are not even 23 close to the power.

So I said, "I can't do that". 1 2 So I go to Mississippi Power. 3 And they said, "Yeah, you can do it, we can take them down, but it's at your expense". 4 5 \$6,000. 6 When do the upgrades stop? 7 Was than an upgrade or was that 8 just a want? 9 And that's what we have -- we 10 And, I mean, I see this grower after 11 grower after grower. 12 I've got a friend Charles --13 Charlie -- Charles Moore. He's suppose to 14 have been here today. He cried on the 15 phone last night because he couldn't be 16 here. 17 He was a Wall Street investor. 18 When he bought his chicken farm he had over 19 \$300,000 in the bank, cash. He was getting 20 a retirement check and -- about \$2500 a month with \$300,000 in the bank. He was 21 22 doing pretty good, wouldn't you think? 23 He messed around and got into

1 chickens. 2 MR. FAMILANT: Mr. Ingrum, if you 3 could wrap up pretty quick. 4 They -- they MR. INGRUM: 5 upgraded him out to where he's broke. 6 Upgrades, so when do upgrades 7 stop. 8 MR. FAMILANT: Okay. I want to 9 turn to the topic that's come up today. 10 Let's talk about the options that growers 11 have to choose among alternative processors 12 with which -- with whom they might 13 contract. What is the distance span from a 14 15 grower within which the grower can consider 16 a processor? 17 Do further distances impact the 18 market weight? How typical is it for growers to 19 20 have two or three options within that 21 business plan? 22 And has -- and has such choice 23 become less comon over the last decade?

1 Some obvious related questions if 2 we can get to them. 3 Does grower profit increase as 4 the number of available processors 5 increases? 6 And how often do growers switch 7 processors? We've heard over here about 8 9 difficulties they face, but I'm -- I'm 10 interested in -- in -- in any data, that 11 anybody, any of the panelists have about 12 how often growers do switch. 13 And I'm going to turn Max Carnes. 14 MR. CARNES: I'm real fortunate 15 where we are, there are four or five 16 integrators that I could choose from. 17 I can tell you this, the best time to 18 choose your integrator when you're building 19 that brand new house. It's a lot harder to 20 talk to somebody else once you've been 21 growing birds for a single integrator. 22 Distance that grower consider a 23 processor. Of course, you could look

around from your house and see if there are any other -- different type integrators or different types farms from you.

But, as a general rule, I would think probably 75 miles is going to stretch it pretty close to the -- how far they want the feed trucks to come.

Do distances impact market weight? Absolutely.

in that haul truck the -- he's losing weight the whole time. Of course, I know the people that I work with, and I assume everybody else, the first thing when that truck gets through the processing plant then he is weighed then. So your weight loss returns to your integrator after it's weighed then.

And do the -- does profit increase with the number of integrators?

And I -- I really don't think it does. I think we've already talked about this earlier today that the contracts are

1 going to be very similar. It's hard to 2 sell a chicken a lot more expensive than --3 than somebody has else. 4 So I -- I don't think there's a 5 whole lot of difference, it's just the type person that you want to fit in with, the 6 7 type integrator that you fit with. 8 You -- you can be comfortable 9 with all of them, but you -- you need to 10 talk with the people who grow for those --11 for that company and find out whether it's 12 a good fit or not. 13 And I -- there are very few 14 people who switch integrators from one to 15 the other. And I would think that the ones 16 that do switch are -- will be switching all 17 the time. You have some people who are 18 never satisfied, I think, but -- I feel 19 very fortunate where I am. 20 MR. FAMILANT: Mr. Taylor. 21 MR. TAYLOR: Okay. There are

five sub questions here in a couple of

minutes. So I'll try to hit them fast.

22

1 On the distance issue, it's 2 roughly 40 miles out is as far. And they 3 would prefer only 20 or 30 miles out. 4 Tyson had a web page up for quite a while 5 that said 40 miles. The main reason, minimize feed 6 7 hauling costs. So the location of the feed 8 mill is the number one consideration. 9 Processing plant is number two. So they 10 want to minimize feed bin bird hauling 11 costs. And that concentrates the poultry 12 operations. Does grower profit increase? 13 14 Well, the publicly available data indicates 15 that there's no profit. 16 Grower profit related to the 17 number of integrators. There's no public 18 data on grower pay, none. 19 Integrators have it, but they 20 share it with each other by complex and by 21 region. 22 That's not unavailable. 23 there's no publicly available data with

1 which to answer that question.

My impression is, no, it doesn't matter.

On the whole switching issue, no, publicly available data on that either, but switching is very, very low. My crude subjective estimate is it would less than 1% per year.

The real problem with switching, you build a house that's got an economic life of, let's say, 30 years. You have two integrators, A and B. If you start with integrator A for a few years, you might have 25-year life remaining. You look at switching to B. Well, it's the same contract and basically the same pay.

And if a grower for A switches to B; then they make integrator A mad and they're stuck with B forever.

So switching is very low, tremendous barriers to switching, including the mandated upgrades. Switching rarely occurs without a grower, even with fairly

1 new house and equipment, being required to 2 make some kind of expensive upgrades. 3 MR. FAMILANT: Before we leave 4 this area of contracts, I -- we have one 5 question from the audience that seems to fit in here. 6 7 The question is: Why don't we 8 observe at least one or two processors 9 owning -- owning growing facilities? 10 Why don't we see that 11 experimentation? 12 It just seems so systematic that 13 -- that we have the grower contract system. 14 Do any of you have any response 15 to that question? 16 I would like to MS. JOHNSON: 17 respond to the question because I've had 18 that come up in trying to organize farmers. 19 And I'll tell you, it's about as 20 easy to herd cats as it is to organize 21 growers. 22 And the reason for is, that it's 23 an atmosphere that is permeated by fear.

1	Growers don't like to be seen at grower
2	association meetings. They don't like the
3	companies to know they're talking to each
4	other. They fear retaliation and, hence,
5	they don't get together and try to
6	coordinate efforts.
7	MR FAMILANT: No, no. But why
8	why doesn't the processer just decide to
9	own farms and
10	MS. JOHNSON: Oh, I see the
11	question, I misunderstood the question.
12	Because it's much cheaper to talk
13	a farmer in to doing it. It's a cost
14	decision, of course.
15	MR. WEAVER: It's because of the
16	investment.
17	MR. FAMILANT: You think that the
18	processor is not willing to make those
19	that scale of investments in the growing
20	process?
21	MS. JOHNSON: If there was money
22	growing in chickens, the processors would
23	be growing chickens.

1 MR. FAMILANT: I think we should 2 now step back and pull together a lot of 3 previous discussion into a really important 4 question. 5 What do we know about the current 6 state of grower profitability? 7 What are the key factors that 8 would lead to a prediction of grower 9 profitability, which grower is going to be 10 profitable and which is not? 11 How sensitive is grower profitability to a reduction in the number 12 13 of flocks he or she raises each year? 14 And what is happening to the 15 ability of growers to meet the terms of 16 their existing loans and secure the loans? 17 And I'll turn to Professor Dicks 18 first. 19 MR. DICKS: Well, I think I --20 you know, first of all, I want to -- sorry, 21 is that working, you know. 22 I want to define profitability 23 again. You know, I think there's a

disconnect between what some people think 1 2 profitability is and what we, as economists 3 or finance people think it is. 4 And I think when -- when people 5 talk about profitability one thing that you're thinking at is my return on -- to my 6 7 assets, my total return. 8 And when we say profitability, 9 what I'm talking about is when I take those 10 gross sales and divide by those -- or the cash sales and divided by that -- or 11 12 subtract out those cash expenses and divide 13 by cash sales again. That's my profitability, that's my profit margin. 14 15 And, again, I've already said 16 that for the growers that profit margin is 17 15 to 30%. And -- and -- and, so, if you 18 think about that, what am I telling you? 19 You know, if you'll take -- if 20 you'll take your revenue and consider that 21 a 45 to 50% of that revenue is going to go

AUDIENCE: (Inaudible).

to your operating expenses. All right.

22

1 MR. DICKS: Then -- then that --2 yeah -- you know -- again, I can only go 3 off what data I have. And here is the -- here are --4 5 the other problem is, and I want to get this right out front is, we have very 6 little data. Okay. 7 8 Most of the data we've collected on -- on -- on farm -- on poultry 9 10 growers comes from Schedule F's, Schedule 11 F's or Schedule K's. And that -- that data 12 is not poultry enterprise data, that's farm 13 data. A lot of times there's categories 14 15 on there that have nothing to do with the 16 poultry enterprise. So we have to kind of 17 nitpick about it. 18 I've -- I've probably done, I 19 don't know how many, hundreds of poultry 20 farms in Eastern Oklahoma and Western Kansas -- Western Arkansas. 21 22 And I'm going to let my comments 23 stand, but I would be willing to bet that

given the state of the industry, that that 1 2 will not hold true for the rest of the 3 United States. And, again, I'm telling you what 4 5 we've looked at, that's what that profitability measure is, is about 15 to 6 7 30%. 8 But the problem is, again, is 9 that sales to fixed assets ratio. How many 10 sales am I generating per dollar of my 11 fixed assets and that's incredibly low. 12 It's low by every standard that 13 was set for financial -- for the financial 14 standards. And that should be in the 15 neighborhood of 80 cents to 90 cents and 16 it's only 20 to 30 cents. So you have 17 tremendous -- you're over capitalized. And 18 that is true for all of agriculture, you 19 know. 20 I'll -- I'll tell my students 21 over and over again that buying land is a 22 poor decision if you're a crop farmer.

Buying poultry house is a poor

1 business if you're a -- if you're a poultry 2 grower, but it's a great -- it could be a great investment. 3 4 So remember that what you're 5 doing is, again, you're -- you're using profitability to pay for those assets in 6 7 the hopes at -- at some point those assets are paid for and I'm going to get both the 8 9 gains from the profit margin and from that 10 sales of fixed asset ratio. So -- so 11 that's -- but that's -- that's the --12 that's the reality of it. 13 So let me just wrap this up. 14 know, what affects profitability? The two 15 -- probably the biggest -- the biggest 16 expense that you have is your -- is your 17 electrical expense, your -- your energy 18 expense, electric and propane. 19 MR. WEAVER: No, your mortgage. 20 MR. DICKS: Well, that's --21 that's a fixed expense. So I'm talking

about just the variable expenses right now,

the case expenses.

22

1 And -- and you have no control 2 over them, none of us do. And that --3 that's stung you hard in the last -- in the 4 last three years. 5 And, of course, the budgets that 6 I'm telling you -- the data I'm talking 7 about, I haven't updated it since 2006, 8 2007. Of course you know that those costs 9 have gone skyrocket since that point in 10 time. 11 I, as a producer, can tell you 12 also that the fertilizer prices have gone 13 through the roof. And that's -- it's 14 killing us. 15 Those are the things that I think 16 I want to make -- make sure I get across. 17 Now, in terms of profit per flock. You know, the -- the profit that 18 19 you make per flock is a function of the 20 number of birds you get; correct? 21 But the profit you -- but then 22 the return on assets that you -- that you 23 make is both a function of the number of

birds that you get and the number of flocksthat you get per year.

So -- so the control of those two numbers is going to affect your return on assets, you know.

Why is it that you would -- would you -- that you would get less birds or less flocks?

The poultry industry, because it's a vertically coordinated industry, is trying to manage your supply.

Why is it trying to manage that supply, because market conditions exist that warrants doing something with supply to maintain a price, a price that's acceptable, a price that will give you some kind of return and give the -- give the integrator some kind of return.

And when the market dies, as it did, because exports dropped from almost 20% down to 16% of supply, it dropped fairly substantially, they have to do something to make up that difference.

If they continue to put out the number of birds, you're going to have a huge drop in price in order to get rid of them or you're going to dump them in a ditch, one or the other.

So the only thing you can do is cut back on -- cut back on output. And if they do it uniformly, they have two choices, they can give you less birds per flock or they can give you less flocks per year, both of which affect your profit margin.

But they also, again, remember as I told you, the integrators have to try to get a hundred percent of capacity. They have to try to manage those plants at full steam in order to make a profit themselves.

And when they cut back birds, they know they're going to lose money, they have to know that. You're losing money, they're losing money, the industry is losing money.

You know, that's -- that's the

way the market works. I don't -- I mean, I 1 2 -- I don't know what else to say. But, you 3 know, I understand I'm -- I'm in the -- I'm 4 in the business myself of raising cattle 5 and the market has been pretty tough on us. You know, I had a hundred and 6 7 sixty-six head in 2000. I'm down to 30 and wish I had them down to zero. For the same 8 9 reason that -- that some -- some of you, 10 I'm sure, wish you were not in the poultry 11 industry because it's been pretty hard in 12 the last five years. 13 All right. Now, we're back being 14 in a turnaround and maybe I'd like to be 15 back to a hundred head after the prices 16 I've seen. But, unfortunately, it's going 17 to take me five years to get there because 18 I can't move them every 40 days. 19 So, anyway, I'll let -- did I do 20 okay? 21 MR. FAMILANT: John Ingrum, quick 22 comments. 23 INGRUM: You know, I sit up

here and I listen to all of these things
that comes around, but the bottom line is
that our -- is our market on the chickens
is based on our weight and our feed and the
number of flocks we get versus the number

of chickens we have placed in the houses.

And the -- a lot of the integrators are cutting the number of chickens we get in the houses or increasing our out time to a longer period of time in which resulted in us missing chickens and that has something to do -- a greater affect on what we get paid, but most of our payments are still based -- it's the same.

I bought my farm from a guy that was in -- in the farm 30 years, in the chicken business 30 years. And he told us -- told me that we get paid the same thing that they use to get paid when they were growing chickens, but the difference is the houses cost 200,000 now and 50,000 when he built his, but we get paid the same.

And when you talk to a lot of

growers they'll say, "Well, we use to make 1 2 good money". And they did. 3 But when you -- when you pay 4 50,000 for a house and -- and then you pay 220,000 for a house, it's -- and you get 5 6 paid the same, I don't see how you make 7 money in chickens. And when we go in to talk to that 8 9 banker or we talk to that integrator, they 10 don't tell us these things, they just shows 11 us the numbers and our head swells and we 12 want to get into the chicken business. 13 My son is 22 years old. He asked 14 me one day, he said, "Daddy, how could you 15 anybody talk you in to being in the chicken 16 business"? 17 And I said, "Son, they told me 18 how much money was I going to make". He said, "Yeah, you might cash 19 20 flow that money, but the bottom line is this". 21 22 I gave up a job making \$80,000 a 23 year to go into the chicken business to

make 30. There's something wrong with that. And -- but it's based on the numbers.

MR. FAMILANT: Professor Taylor.

MR. TAYLOR: Well, the only set of information on actual profitability for contract poultry producers done with managerial accounting, rather than tax accounting, is the Alabama Farm Business Analysis Association, which I have nothing to do with.

But trained farm management experts sit down with participating farmers and ranchers and growers who have paid quite a bit to participate. And they go through everything, every little receipt and decide what percentage of the pair of gloves you buy goes to cows and to poultry and so forth. Those records go back to 1995.

10 of the 15 years, after taking out basically minimum wage, there is a negative return. They've lost money, on

average, 10 out of 15 years. And the loses
are much larger than the gains.

Another set of public information, is a highly detailed survey done by USDA. It's called an ARMS Survey. And you can go, even online, and get a summary for different production specialties.

For the poultry specialty averaged over 1996 through '08, 13 years, the average rate of return on equity, they take out a charge for unpaid family and operator labor, after taking that out, there is a negative return on equity.

Part of the deception that goes on, and I've seen this in a written representation made by an integrator to growers, they show 20% return, you're making 20% on your money.

They're not using the same accounting concept that they're required to use in their on financial statements.

They're including what little you get for

1 your labor there. 2 If you take minimum wage out for 3 labor, it's probably negative. 4 MR. FAMILANT: Let me -- let me 5 continue with this thought because this is 6 going to be a question for Professor 7 Taylor, too. What information do growers have 8 9 when they enter into the business and sign 10 those very first contracts? 11 Are there significant 12 opportunities for the integrators to exert 13 what economists call close contract 14 opportunity and impose unanticipated 15 demands on the -- on the growers? 16 And with what frequency do we --17 do we observe this? 18 Do we -- is there any data on the 19 -- on the frequency? 20 MR. TAYLOR: Frequency is 21 basically is every one of them. 22 The -- there is very little 23 public information on contract poultry

1 production. There's all kinds on wholesale 2 and retail chicken prices weekly, highly detailed. 3 You can go to your USDA web sites 4 5 or listen to the news and you can get morning and afternoon cattle and hog 6 7 prices. There is nothing on average 8 contract pay, not even annual. 9 You can go to USDA and get cost 10 of production budgets for corn and cotton 11 and hogs and cattle, nothing on poultry. 12 So potential growers are really 13 at the mercy of representations made to 14 them by integrators. 15 MR. FAMILANT: Mr. Gibson, your 16 comment? 17 MR. GIBSON: What information the 18 growers get when they first enter the 19 business is the signed contracts. 20 Of course, we have a list of 21 things that we furnish any potential 22 grower. 23 And that grower also has to make

1 a decision to sit down with his banker and 2 get all the information there, too. 3 So if they're misguided, I think 4 it would be from the lending institution. 5 First of all, whenever we get a 6 new grower, a potential new grower, we give 7 them a packet that offers a copy of our contract. We don't hide anything. They're 8 9 eligible to take a look at it, read it. 10 Copy of the building 11 specifications. 12 List of contractors and builders 13 that service the area. 14 List of equipment suppliers. 15 We furnish a list of banks and 16 lending agencies that finance poultry 17 loans. 18 We show and discuss any company 19 qualification and calculations. 20 We tell them to sit down with the 21 bank and let them go through this totally 22 again and decide if they want to get in the 23 chicken business and if that bank wants to

1 loan them the money. We file a list of other items 2 3 that are needed such as the amount of 4 property, permits, utilities, dead bird disposal provisions, litter storage, dirt 5 6 work, road construction. 7 Even have to remind them about 8 the equipment they'll need like tractors to 9 operate their farm. 10 We want to them know everything 11 there is before they get into the business. 12 A copy of our live production 13 program is given to them. 14 We encourage every potential 15 grower to go and visit with other growers, 16 go and talk to them, see what they think 17 about the business. 18 They can contact and discuss with 19 whomever you want to, your family, your 20 friends, your attorney. 21 We'll offer to take you to visit 22 the poultry operation. 23 We offer to take you on tours of

1 our plants, our hatcheries and our -- our 2 feed mills. 3 It's all about close contractural 4 opportunities and unanticipated demands. 5 Again, I can only speak for our 6 company. 7 And we look at the relationships 8 of our growers as being long-term. If it's 9 not mutually -- something is wrong if it's 10 not mutually beneficial to both of us. 11 It's not in the best interest of 12 our company or any other company, I don't 13 think, to impose economic hardships on a 14 grower. 15 And as long as we keep continuing 16 to put growers out of business, the bank is 17 not going to loan money to get new growers 18 to replace them. 19 A productive grower network is 20 important for us. It's essential for us to 21 compete in the marketplace. We have to 22 have good growers.

Our management feels strongly

1 about upgrades for the ones that are 2 lowering costs to improve efficiencies in live operations. We'll offer incentives to 3 4 offset those costs. 5 It has to be mutually beneficial 6 to both us and the grower or we're not 7 interest in looking at it. 8 These changes in technology 9 improvement -- improve management 10 practices, not only in this industry, but 11 as in any other business. 12 And to what frequency, I think 13 it's varying. MR. FAMILANT: I think this leads 14 15 to a natural follow-up question that at 16 least three of you have submitted in some 17 form. 18 In most areas there are -- there 19 still are numbers of -- of people who 20 wanted to grow broilers and wanted to --21 they want to secure loans. 22 How are we suppose to determine 23 this fact that there are -- there are these

1 people lined up to get in the business? 2 If growers don't expect to see a 3 return on their investment, why are they 4 getting into the industry? 5 And, again, as many people have asked from the audience, why do banks lend 6 7 to these people? 8 Let's -- let's turn to Mr. 9 Weaver. 10 MR. WEAVER: Is that my question? 11 MR. FAMILANT: Yes. 12 MR. WEAVER: I have some other 13 comments I'd like to make as far as the 14 growers income and such that we were 15 addressing earlier and I didn't get to 16 address. 17 But current growers are 18 increasingly discouraging their families, their sons and daughters, their nieces and 19 20 nephews to get into the poultry business 21 because they, plain and simple, will not 22 make money doing it. 23 I'll use myself for example.

I think the statement has been made here
that the biggest cost you have is your
fuel. And outside of your mortgage, that's
true.

But my mortgage on my poultry operation is \$84,000 a year. Last year I grossed a hundred and nine thousand dollars. And I was the number one grower three times.

So what does that tell you folks?

Part of that was -- one -- one of
the previous questions was that the
companies cut back on the number of flocks
or placing the number chickens you get.

Part of that drop in my income was that I lost the equivalent of a whole flock of chickens because of the cutbacks.

We're -- a lot of our growers in our area are so frustrated, and they've lost so much money, that they intend to close down their operation in the very near future. Luckily for them, they're most of the people who have their operations paid

for and they can do it without losing their
home and their farm.

But most of us are in debt to one degree or another. And if we do that, we'll probably going to lose our home and our farm.

Somebody this morning made the comment that that farm had been in their family for eight generations. Those are the kinds of situations we're placed in.

And the question being what -you know, why would people want to get into
these contracts like this?

As a general rule, the majority of growers I've talked to that have done that, when the companies that -- no disrespect to Mr. Bishop, I don't know how he runs his business, I hope everything he says is true, and I wish it -- I wish it was that way industry wide.

But, as a general rule, the figures that growers get from the companies trying to talk them into building houses

1 are misrepresented.

Now -- and I've seen them do it.

They'll say, "Well, now, here's -- here's the average that growers make, but if you do real good, you can make as much money as you can". And that's another 30, \$40,000 a year.

Well, unfortunately I have never met a grower that is on the top every time. If there's one out there, I wish you raise your hand, I'd like to shake your hand, and I'd like you to tell me how you do it because I've never met anybody else who could do it. I don't think this happens.

And listened to Doctor Taylor here, again, and it show that it doesn't happen.

MR. FAMILANT: If we could move along because we've got -- I really want to get in at least one more question and let -- and let Professor Dicks respond to this.

And we're coming up on our -- well, we're about out of time.

1	MR. WEAVER: This last question
2	here says, if they don't want these
3	particular contract terms, why do they sign
4	them?
5	MR. FAMILANT: Yeah.
6	MR. WEAVER: I think we've
7	already answered that. They get an
8	ultimatum, you sign here or you don't get
9	chickens.
10	MR. FAMILANT: Professor Dicks
11	with some some quick thoughts.
12	MR. DICKS: Well, just a couple
13	of things.
14	You know, Mr. Weaver, if I'll ask
15	you, you know, you said you had an
16	eighty-five \$84,000 dollar mortgage
17	payment.
18	How much of that was interest?
19	MR. WEAVER: I don't know. Let
20	me think a second here. It's like \$25,000
21	was interest.
22	MR. DICKS: So that's the only
23	expense. The other part is principle.

```
1
       That doesn't -- you know -- that's --
 2
       that's --
 3
                 MR. WEAVER: It's not principle,
 4
       but --
5
                 MR. DICKS: You know -- you know,
       but look here, folks, this is -- you know,
6
7
       one of the problems in America today, and
       you know this is true for all of America,
8
9
       is we have a real problem with financial
10
       literacy in this country.
11
                 And that's why -- that's why
12
       we're having the problems we have with all
13
       the mortgages crisis and that's why we're
14
       having a problem having this conversation.
15
                 You know, if we're going to tap
16
       -- if we're going to talk about finance, we
17
       ought to talk about using the same terms.
18
       You have to look at the same things; right?
19
                 If you were making a principle
20
       payment that's no different -- you've made
21
       the decision to invest in a poultry house
22
       rather than invest in the stock market,
23
       that's an investment. That's not -- you
```

```
1
       can't make that -- you can't use that as a
 2
       deduction. I understand that that means
       you have less money, but nonetheless, but
 3
4
       that principle payment is not -- not
5
       considered in finance as an expense.
                                              So
       you can't use that.
6
7
                 And that's one of the things I
8
       want to come back to --
9
                 AUDIENCE: Well, look at --
10
                 MR. DICKS: -- excuse me, let me
11
       finish.
12
                 MR. FAMILANT: Let him finish,
13
       please, please.
14
                 AUDIENCE: -- is down by 76%, it
15
       is an expense.
                 MR. FAMILANT: Let him make his
16
17
       point.
                 MR. DICKS: Well, let me just say
18
19
       this, I'll just make it real easy on you.
20
                 You know, I -- I -- yeah --
21
       again, I -- I can tell you -- I can't -- in
22
       -- in my twenty -- 21 years plus at
23
       Oklahoma State University, I don't how many
```

farmers, both my students and I, have analyzed doing business plans for.

But I will tell you this, across the country I've -- you know, I've farmed in four different states, I've been all over the United States and all over the world, and I can tell you that of all the farms in the United States that I've looked at, I bet you less than 2% have the financial records necessary to run a business.

And I'm not dissing anybody,
that's a real problem, that's one that I'm
-- I'm trying to fix.

You know, I'll just ask y'all out there, how many people have an income statement on hand, a balance sheet, a cash flow statement, enterprise budgets and the financial ratios necessary to look at your operations?

And I guarantee you this, if your bank doesn't have it, your bank shouldn't have lent you any money.

And I've looked at a lot of the Farm Service Agency guaranteed loans and they don't have them.

And, in fact, just to let you know our state office, our state office, our state office, our state FSA office this week has sent out a notice that provided guidelines to the banks on what was necessary in order to give loans for concentrated feeding operations.

So it -- it -- it indicates there is a problem out there. And one of the problems that -- that this question is getting at is why are people -- why are people getting into the poultry industry when you-all have these problems.

Well, number one, is they're not being told -- if you're not talking to and they're getting -- they're getting a form that's only giving them that gross profit I was talking about. So it looks pretty good.

And they go down to the bank.

And what does the bank give them a loan on, their collateral, plus it's a guaranteed loan.

All of those things set in motion something that we're seeing here today is a lot -- a lot of problems in the industry.

out a loan, right, and you can't cash flow with 60% of your variable expenses, you shouldn't have taken out that loan in the first place because if you took it out with the understanding that you were going to only have 45% of that be variable expenses, and the propane expense went up or the feed expense or something else happened, you're going to be underwater and you're not going to be able to pay your note.

And if I'm a banker, I don't want to do that. I don't want to give you that because I don't have want to own a poultry -- I don't want to own a poultry farm.

MR. WEAVER: Mr. Dicks, here's something right here I'd like to offer for

1 an example. And anybody that wants to is 2 welcome to come and look at this. 3 This is a grower settlement from 4 1985. In 1985 these growers could make as 5 much as 4.85 cents a pound for their 6 chickens. 7 Today the company I grow for our 8 base pay is 5.05, that's two-tenths of a 9 cent more than it was 25 years ago in 1985. 10 That's the problem, that's part of the 11 problem. 12 Another part is this right here. 13 This -- this is a receipt for Kentucky 14 Fried Chicken for a 12-piece bucket of 15 chicken that was purchased last week. This 16 -- this 12-piece bucket of chicken costs 17 \$26.99. And out of that -- out of that 18 \$26.99, the grower that raised the chicken 19 got 30 cents. 20 MR. FAMILANT: All right. 21 Let's --22 MR. WEAVER: The -- the state and 23 -- and the city that sold this, where this

was purchased, got \$2.16 and they didn't do 1 2 a thing for it. 3 MR. FAMILANT: All right. Everybody -- everybody -- we've got to stop 4 5 very, very shortly and I want to hear this 6 last question in because it's very 7 important. This will be our last question. 8 We've recently had court rulings 9 that producers must prove competitive harm 10 before succeeding in a case alleging an 11 unfair practice under the Packers and 12 Stockyards Act. 13 What are examples of how alleged 14 unfair practices might and might not be 15 related to competitive harm? 16 In view of these decisions, what 17 will growers or USDA have to do differently 18 in order to challenge a possibly unfair 19 practice? 20 And what could a grower, an 21 ordinary grower be able to put together? 22 What kind of economic evidence 23 could that grower put together to support

1 such a complaint of an unfair practice? 2 And I'm going to turn to Ms. 3 Johnson for that. 4 MS. JOHNSON: Thank you. 5 appreciate it. As I said, I've been representing 6 7 growers for a long time, about 20 years. 8 And back in the 90's when we were trying to 9 get these growers in Georgia organized I 10 use to go to meetings and I would be the featured speaker most of the time. 11 12 And they would get up and they 13 would introduce me and they'd say, "Ms. 14 Johnson here has one every case she's had 15 for every poultry farmer she's ever 16 represented". 17 And that wasn't quite true. I'd 18 lost one, it was on a technicality. 19 But I would get up and I would 20 wave the flag and talk about how there's 21 this wonderful sword that growers have 22 available to them. And it's called the 23 Packers and Stockyards Act.

And it prohibits any unfair or unjustly discriminatory or deceptive practice.

And when they terminate your contract because you're at this meeting we can go forward and we can file this claim under the Packers and Stockyards Act and we can get your chickens back. And that gave a lot of comfort to the farmers who stuck their necks out in Georgia back in the '90's.

And it grieves me to have to tell you folks who are sitting here today that that sword that we had available to us to use for all those years has turned into more like a feather than a sword.

I don't see a single grower here from Georgia. And I know why that is because the growers in Georgia who took on this battle have been pretty much cut down and stomped on.

The fellow who was here earlier, the gentleman from the Council, Poultry

1 Growers, what's that called again?

National Broilers Growers, or whatever, Council -- Chicken Growers. I can't get the name right.

He made a good point. The

Council has spent a lot of money on lawyers
to convince our courts that growers ought
not have any federal rights. And that is

-- that's a snowball. It's keeps on
rolling down the hill and gathering up more
and more snow and keeps rolling over
farmers.

The most recent decision is the Terry Case out of the 6th Circuit. And that case isn't over yet. And I'm not real comfortable talking about a case that's not over, and, especially, when the lawyers for Tyson are sitting up there on second row.

But suffice it to say, there's something wrong in America when a grower like Mr. Terry over here in the red shirt complains to the -- to GIPSA, to the USDA, the federal agency that's charged with the

responsibility of making sure that growers 1 2 receive adequate pay for their efforts 3 complains because Tyson is stealing from him, gets cut off for his efforts and has 4 5 no remedy. There's something wrong with the laws in America if he has no redress. 6 7 MR. FAMILANT: Thank you. 8 other panelists want to -- any other 9 panelist want to say anything before we 10 close on this particular comment? 11 MR. CARNES: We do have one 12 grower from Georgia. Thank you. 13 And if I can make MS. JOHNSON: 14 an observation. 15 And I have a lot of respect for 16 Mr. Carnes. We talked before the panel 17 today. And he seems to be a very capable 18 grower, a very astute businessman, but I 19 believe he's a -- also in another business. 20 And that's the paving business. 21 And it's possible to grow 22 chickens when you have another business and 23 you would profit. And it's -- it's called

writing off some of your losses.

And I don't know whether you've ever lost any money in the chicken business, but I want to address -- the question that you had a little while ago that I misunderstood, I've had a little time to think about that question. And it really goes to the upgrade question as well.

And that is, why don't -- why don't companies go out and build their own chicken houses and hire their own employees and put their own employees in these chicken houses and grow chickens and I'll you exactly why they don't. It's because of supply and demand.

It's because if they were investing more than half of what they've already got in processing plants, they got to turn around and put the same amount or more money into the houses to grow the chickens. First of all, they have that huge capital outlay in the -- in the

1 assets.

And then they've got to hire all the employees to grow the chickens. And those employees are entitled to benefits under federal law as employees, including unemployment if they're laid off.

Including workers' compensation if they get hurt in the chicken house.

All those benefits that you get if you're employed, you don't get if you're an independent contractor; right?

AUDIENCE: Right.

MS. JOHNSON: What was -- when was the last time you got a check from the government when the -- for unemployment when the chicken processor left you out of chickens. It doesn't happen.

Okay. So it's a way for the processing companies to control costs and to adjust for the ebbs and flows of the market.

And I'm not an economist, I'm a lawyer, but that's what I have observed

1 over the last 20 years. 2 Thank you. MR. FAMILANT: 3 I want to thank the panelists for 4 a truly spirited exchange here. 5 And I want thank the audience. 6 You guys were as attentive as any panel 7 audience I have ever seen in my life. You 8 guys paid great attention. 9 Thank you very much. 10 Ten minutes -- ten minute break before the next panel. 11 12 (Whereupon, the taking of the 13 proceedings was recessed from approximately 3:53 p.m. to 14 15 approximately 4:16 p.m., after 16 which the following proceedings 17 were had and done:) 18 MR. FERRELL: We're going to go 19 ahead and get started again. And for the 20 next hour we'll have another round of 21 public comment. 22 And we'll use the same form as we 23 did before, is people who got a ticket who

wanted to have a right to comment, if you could just line up in front of each microphone.

And I -- I would -- I ask for you-all's cooperation in trying to keep it as two minutes as close to possible because for each persons that provides a longer term amount of comments means fewer people get to actually provide comments. So if you could keep it closer to two minutes the better.

And, so -- oh, and I might just mention, just to help you keep staying closer to two minutes, we do have a timer that has a light. And it goes from green, yellow to red.

And, so, anyway, we'll go ahead and get started right here.

MS. LESLIE HAYES: Hi, I am -- I want to thank you-all for this opportunity to be here. And appreciate the fact that both the DOJ and USDA are playing very close attention to this issue.

My name is Leslie Hayes. I'm an attorney with the Farmers Legal Action

Group. We're a nonprofit law firm that represents farm -- family farmers and ranchers.

We've been working with contract poultry growers for probably 15 to 20 years now.

And since I'm a lawyer I have a very hard time with two minutes, although, I'm use to seeing those lights.

But let me just try to make some suggestions on how DOJ and USDA should work together on -- particularly related to enforce the Packers and Stockyards Act.

And I think the first thing that
we need to -- that the Department of
Agriculture needs to be very firm on is the
understanding that the Packers and
Stockyards Act is different than every
other antitrust and unfair practices act in
this country.

The emphasis of that act was not

just to protect consumers, but separately
to protect producers. And, therefore, we
need DOJ and USDA to develop a very clear
policy analysis of how they are going to

5 protect producers under that act.

We need to have them develop, in detail, how they're going to take all these scenarios that have been presented in the poultry industry today, from the ranking system to the insecurity on the duration of the contracts, to the upgrade issues. And take those scenarios and develop the legal analysis that will be used under the Packers and Stockyards Act to address those issues, which aspects of them can you address and how.

And I think that it's absolutely imperative that the agencies have a clear analysis of that.

And my suggestion would be with this joint task force is that you put your best and brightest lawyers and your best and brightest economists together and you

sit down and you have the lawyers do the legal analysis for each individual scenario or practice that has been raised.

And to the extent that you don't automatically have the information, in part, because there's so limited information in the industry, you ask the economists what do we need and how would we ask the question and how do we get it.

Then you use the very broad and effective investigation and information gathering authorities that USDA has and force the integrators to give you the information.

That has never been done, to my knowledge, was the attempted effort to have regular reports from the integrators.

And my understanding, I believe under the Packers and Stockyards Act, you have the authority to ask the integrators for any information on their relationship with the growers that you want and need to assess their practices and whether they're

legal under the act.

With that regard, I don't want -I -- I also think that it's absolutely
imperative that in these regulations that
USDA will be issuing in the near future
that they take -- that the Agency maintain
it's position.

That under A and B of Section 192 that you don't to prove any competitive effect. That has been the position of the Agency, I believe, from day one in the passage of the act. You should maintain that position.

In addition to that, you should go the next mile and define how it is at that -- how the various practices that you will be addressing in the rules do, in fact, affect competition or injure, cause adverse competition.

And when you do that it needs to be looking, not at the consumer, which traditional antitrust law does, but, in fact, at the producer and the monopsony

power of the integrators and how that affects the producer.

And I think that's the unique aspect of the Packers and Stockyards Act.

And that we need to develop a very strong, clearly defined policy and guidelines and exactly how you're going to enforce in each of the livestock and poultry industries under the specific -- to apply it to the specific scenarios that you're hearing about.

And that, then, in addition to that on a long-term basis -- that can be done right now. But on a long term basis I think you should be issuing regular orders requiring packers -- or integrators in this case to report to you the information that the Agency needs to investigate and maintain a handle on exactly what is happening in the markets.

And I think that you have the authority to do that. Have a system that you will then use that information, analyze

1 it on a regular basis and bring any 2 enforcement actions between USDA, referring 3 them to DOJ, that that information on an 4 ongoing basis presents. 5 My time is up. Thank you very 6 much. 7 MR. FRED PARRISH: My name is 8 Fred Parrish. And I had a statement 9 prepared, but pretty much most of it has 10 been covered real well. 11 But -- so I just wanted to share 12 some experiences under this tournament pay 13 or performance pay. 14 I've had add some flocks of 15 chickens that were delivered that were 16 sick. One had aspergillosis and the 17 company knew it, it come from the hatchery, 18 and I had a high mortality and the birds 19 didn't perform. 20 And I had one that had rickets 21 and a high mortality and the birds really 22 didn't perform. 23 And I wound up with a, I think

one of them was a hundred and sixty-seven 1 2 and one of them was a hundred and 3 eighty-four points below average. And the 4 company knew that it wasn't anything I did, 5 but I'm the one that suffered the loss. They took my performance and 6 7 subtracted it from base pay and that's what 8 I got. But it wasn't anything I done, it 9 was something that happened to the birds 10 before I got them. 11 I've had them bring feed out that would be molded and you couldn't get it out 12 13 of the bins. To them it doesn't matter, 14 you know. 15 You'll hear them say, "Well, yeah, it does matter, why would they do 16 17 that"? 18 They do it, I don't know why, but 19 they do. 20 And I wound up on the -- the 21 probationary thing. They cut base pay, 22 which cuts my pay because I had fallen down

to the six block average of 60 points below

23

1 average.

And -- but, now, you know, when they wanted something out of me the next batch, they wanted me to take birds back early because somebody wasn't going to be ready.

And I told them, you know, is you-all done this to me, you knew it was your fault that I'm here, you know. I'm not doing you no favors if you're not going to help me.

I told them, "You know, you give me back my birds, you know, take me off probation then I will take them back".

Well, I reckon they needed bad enough at that time and they did give them back to me on my next flock and took me off of probation.

As it was them, and I lost a lot of money off of that because I've got six houses that holds -- well, now, I was getting 12 -- was getting 20,000 for the house, but they've cut it back to 19, but,

1 at that time, we were only getting sixteen 2 seven. And when we originally started with 3 them we were getting 20,000 to the house. 4 And the only thing that changed 5 was the number of birds we got. 6 weights went down when they was suppose to 7 qo up. 8 And whatever they say they make 9 things so that you can't hardly get out of 10 It keeps you in debt one way of the 11 other, you know. They may give you a 12 raise, but they cut weights and you still 13 can't make any more money. 14 I made as much as \$50,000 the 15 first year I put in a batch. Now, after I've spent close to \$200,000, I think my 16 17 best check has been 52 or \$53,000. That's 18 with the incentive pay. And that's been 19 12 years that I've been with them, you 20 know. 21 It's just not right the way they 22 did it. I mean, it's manipulative.

Thank you.

23

MS. PATTY LAVERIA: Hi. My name
is Patty Laveria, but I'm actually going to
read a statement for someone who -- a
grower who is very interested in coming
today, but couldn't make it to this
meeting.

His name is Reed Phifer. And

His name is Reed Phifer. And he's gone turkeys and broiler chickens for 23 years under three different integrators with -- with many contract changes.

And, so, what he wrote was that I believe when a poultry company entices a grower to borrow and a lending institution to loan a very large amount of money to build what I consider to be no more than a company farm, the company should be forced to see that the debt is paid in full.

I think this should be done even it means making the poultry company the co-borrower and as much as responsible as the primary borrower.

This means that if money is borrowed to be paid back in a 10-year time

frame, the contract should stay in place
for that period of time.

What the company can accomplish through this channel is to have in possession a facility that produces their poultry with cheap labor and no capital outlay. This is labor the company knows they cannot afford -- this is labor the company knows cannot afford to question anything asked of them.

I feel making the integrators stand behind their contracts until the debt is paid in full should be mandatory. This is the -- this is for when the contract was presented to the lending institution. This was the major factor used in calculating how this very large amount of money will be repaid.

The integrator is selling the lender a bill of goods that the loan will be repaid on the premise that the payback numbers are generated by the integrator's contract are exact and guaranteed.

I understand from talking with a previous grower that Tyson is going to a guaranteed payback contract. This is not to say they want a burden of this magnitude, but it is saying the lending institutions are not loaning money unless their payback is guaranteed.

A second point that he makes is that a poultry company should never have authority to require mandatory upgrades without measures in place to fund the additional work at no cost to the grower.

The company should feel confident in their ability to define the exact procedures needed to produce their poultry. This should be clearly defined in their initial contract wording so as to make sure there is no need to add amendments which could cause the grower undue stress.

When and if the company learns of new technology that will help profit the production of their poultry, they should be responsible for the additional capital

1 outlay.

And one last point that he makes is that the grower should have some piece of mind concerning contract security. They honestly have no idea what may happen from one day until the next.

This is one reason I would suggest that companies needing additional space for growing their poultry be required by regulation to stand behind any loan acquiring monies for this purpose until paid in full.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I'm making a comment on behalf of a grower who would not come here today, was not able to come here today because of fear of retaliation.

I'm reading his conclusion first.

These comments are real and serious. I cannot reveal my identity for fear of sever consequences, like no more chickens. There is, incidentally, a blacklist among integrators so any grower cut off will not be picked up by another

1 integrator.

The subject for this memo is, as a contract poultry grower the Secretary of Agriculture and the Attorney General for the USDA Poultry Workshop. This is an uncommon opportunity and I thank you for it.

Unpaid mandatory upgrades.

Requirements prefaced by you will not chickens get back until 36 months ago new cool cell pads 20,000 -- \$2,000.

24 months ago demands lighting, \$2500.

20 months ago new feed bins \$8,000.

Requirements prefaced by, perhaps you should just stop growing chickens because you're old and it would cost too much to bring your houses up to standard.

12 months ago new ceilings, new ceiling, new heaters, new baffles, new cool cells door, a hundred twenty thousand dollars, and four months lost production.

1 Requirements prefaced by, You 2 want to sell farm, new controllers will be 3 required. Two months new controllers, 4 5 \$14,000. 6 Summary, a hundred and fifty 7 thousand dollars for three years for the 8 privilege of remaining to be a contract 9 grower. 10 Recommendation. Integrators are 11 paid in full for required upgrades. 12 Two, lack of contract security. 13 I get a one year contract, which says that 14 if I fail to respond to any requirement, 15 they can refuse to put chickens back in my 16 houses. 17 Summary. Integrator has 18 demonstrated numerous times by you will not 19 get chickens back until that there is not 20 even 1-year security. 21 Recommendation. Integrator 22 should be required to give real contract 23 which extends through the amortization of

1 houses and improvements. 2 Unfair payment system. The 3 tournament method of payment has been used 4 This means that the integrator for years. 5 computes the flock average price, covers 6 how that's done. 7 Summary. There's a common thing 8 that the integrator than can send the check 9 with the chickens, meaning that all the 10 factors are controlled by an integrator. 11 Recommendation. USDA should 12 declare this practice as unfair. 13 Insufficient base rate increases. 14 Got a token raise of about 5% two years, 15 which brings compensation for over a 16 million dollar facility to just under 17 minimum wage. 18 Summary. Why do I do this, my 19 children will have no part of it. 20 Recommendation. For the industry 21 to survive, there has to be better 22 compensation to contract growers. 23 Financial institutions are

1 rapidly slowing the number of poultry farm 2 loans and requiring more security. 3 will bring the industry and this country to 4 its knees. 5 Finally, lack of Packers and Stockyards action. I had a visit from 6 7 Packers and Stockyards about ten years ago. They listened to my story and thanked me 8 9 for my time and left. Do they still exist? 10 Summary. As it currently 11 operated, it has not effect on the poultry 12 industry. 13 Recommendation. Congress should 14 amend the Packers and Stockyards Act to 15 give USDA full enforcement over unfair and 16 deceptive practices in the poultry sector. 17 Packers should prohibit poultry 18 companies from cancelling contracts without 19 adequate cause. 20 Packers and Stockyards should be 21 required to enforce growers rights rather 22 than uphold poultry companies.

Thank you for your time.

23

for the opportunity. The purpose, my friend could not make it, he just got cut off of chickens last week. They pulled his contract. And he asked me to come and give this testimony of what me -- what he has proposed that might would help all of us in the chicken business.

The purpose of this is to protect and give security to the livelihood and the source of retirement for each farmer who has worked for years, years of no comfortable future for their family.

He said one permit should be issued to each existing poultry house under contract at present by the federal or state government before any more houses to be built.

A new person interested should have to purchase a permit house per house solely from the owner who has permit in hand, one permit to a house.

Example, if there was 975 houses

in a state, the integrators could not build no more houses unless a new fellow, a new person interested should have to find a farmer that wants to get out of the business on his own terms, buy his permitted houses from him so that no integrator could cut him off for little or no reason.

This is to ensure that the permitted farmer has a little security for his or her future. No more houses could built in the state without a permit.

One permit equals one house. If a farmer has four houses he has four permit. On permit is valued at \$30,000.

People in cities and counties are complaining about the smell, flies and environmental impact to these communities.

The chicken companies want to build new houses every year so houses that have a little age can be cut off or made to update to comply with their rules, regulations so they have you so deep in

debt that you cannot make a rationale decision.

At present farmers have put up all their land, houses, everything they own, their parents and grandparents to get into this operation with no say so at all to where someone else pushes the pencil to how much you make.

This is the first million and a half dollar investment for a minimum wage job that I've ever had with no security at all.

I thank y'all.

MR. BILL RONICK: Good afternoon.

My name is Bill Ronick. I'm with the

National Chicken Council. And I appreciate
the opportunity like many of the other

speakers and panelists today, we appreciate
this opportunity.

I'd like to mention a couple things for the record, they've been said before, but I'd just like to reemphasize those and I have a couple of other

1 thoughts.

Companies have tremendous
economic and competitive incentives to
produce good chicks and good feed. If they
don't, they're at a competitive and
economic disadvantage to other companies.
And, so, they want to produce the best
chicks and the best feed that they can, but
it's a biological process in the case of
the chicks, and that makes it much more
difficult.

For 35 years, until last year, broiler production increased. We talk about volatility in agriculture, there certainly is that, there's certainly is that in broilers.

But if there's stability in agriculture, I would suggest that the broiler industry offers more stability than some other parts of agriculture based on that 35-year record.

If you go back 35 years, I would suggest the reason production was adjusted

downward then was because of government policy.

And I'm not suggesting the reason we adjusted production down last year was government policy, but I think it was part of it.

This year broiler production,
luckily, is increasing again, USDA says 2%.

I think maybe we can do a little bit more
than that, but every other meat, beef,
pork, turkey, their production is down this
year. Broilers is the only one that's
going up. Next year we're going up again
more than 2%, 3%, maybe more. So we're
continuing to get back on this track of
continually growing year after year.

One of the questions is why don't companies grow -- own grow out facilities.

Well, a large company in

California, one of the largest companies

does, in fact, grow its -- own essentially

all their grow out production. In

California they're one of the most

profitable companies, I haven't seen their
books, but I understand they're one of the
most profitable companies.

There's a small company in Ohio
-- I've already spoke for two minutes.

A small company in Ohio does -owns their own production, so whether large
or small.

And then there's other companies in between that grows -- that owns some of their own production.

And just quickly, Brazil, Mexico, China, a lot of other countries would not only just like to take our export markets overseas, they would like to export their product here.

And I'm going to say -- and we're not going to get into the word if, I'm going to say when these companies meet USDA's inspection requirements, their product will be coming here. And we will be competing against not just their product, but their growers, their feed,

1 their chicks.

So it's a global world competitively and it's getting more so.

International trade, our exports take about 20% last year. Russia and China, as we speak, are disrupted, they're our two biggest markets. They account for 40% of our exports. We hope those markets return, but, as I speak, they are disrupted. And, luckily so far, I don't think that problem has gone back to the growers, I think there's some insulation there.

The one question I was asked that I didn't hear a good answer is, when I talk to companies, most companies, many companies, if not most companies, have a list of people who want to grow chickens or want to add to production.

Now, I understand in the short
run, perhaps, you can misrepresent the
information, but we've been doing this for
four, five decades. And as Abraham Lincoln

said, "You can trick some of the people or fool some of the people some of the time, but it's very difficult to fool all the people all the time".

So I'd like to hear an answer about, if this such a bad deal, why have we've been able for four or five decades to continue to have people who would like to get into the business.

And I appreciate this opportunity. Thank you.

MR. KIRBY NASERY: I'm Kirby
Nasery. I've been in the business for 21
years as a poultry grower.

To answer your question that you just asked. When I got in it in 1989, I was working offshore on an oil rig. My father had retired. My wife had a really good job and we were doing really good. We put every dime back we made back into chicken -- six chicken houses for seven years. We paid for them in seven years. That's -- that's unheard of, but we put

1 every dime we made back into them.

I wasn't even going to bring that up, but the reason I got up was for the ranking system.

Right now I'm number nine out of 333 growers on a six block average. I've got two three house farms. I'm also number 126 of 333 farms.

Now, how is the ranking system fair? Everything I have got is the same. I've got the same equipment. Get the chickens the same day, sell them the same day. How is this possible if the ranking system is fair?

Do I spend more time in three houses than I do the other three houses?

Do I better -- do I do a better job?

My -- my opinion of it is we get a lot of split loads of feeds. And I have never called the Packers and Stockyards about this, but we will get three farms -- three different farms on one truck of feed.

1 You've got a driver that comes 2 out there, stays on the cell phone the whole time he's unloading feed, you know. 3 6,000 pounds on three houses, which is one 4 5 bin of feed, makes two points feed 6 conversion. Two points feed conversion can 7 cost me \$3,000. I just -- you know, I don't -- I 8 9 don't know the answer for the ranking 10 system, but what we've got is not fair. 11 have been on top and I have been on bottom. 12 And, like I say, I don't have an 13 answer for it, but, anyway, thank you. 14 MR. DONALD RAY WILKES: I'm 15 Donald Ray Wilkes from Geneva County, 16 Alabama. 17 There's been a lot of things 18 discussed here that I've dealt with. 19 thing that I'd like to mention, although 20 all that's been talked about, is upgrades. 21 And the biggest thing in our 22 input into chickens are feed. The 23 technology that's available today, why

1	aren't there some sort of technology on
2	that truck to let them know that this house
3	and this bin putting this much feed in it.
4	If they can do it at a feed lot where
5	there's cattle running across the trough
6	there and he moves a foot and notices he's
7	at the wrong spot, why can't this be done
8	with chicken feed because I had it happen
9	to me.
10	A load of feed came in on a
11	Saturday. When it sold I had the best feed
12	conversion of anybody, wasn't nobody around
13	me.
14	They came down and I told them to
15	go back and look at where there feed is.
16	He said, "We haven't got it.
17	I told him to come back on that
18	Friday if they didn't get it because all it
19	was going to do was hurt some other
20	growers.
21	So I produced the ticket for him.
22	He said, "We haven't gotten it".
23	A week later in the mail they

1 made up a ticket and sent it to me. 2 So the technology that's 3 available today, why aren't they upgrading the feed trucks. 4 5 Thank you. 6 MR. ALTON TERRY: I guess a lot 7 of you might know who I am. I'm Alton Terry. All I wanted to do was watch my 8 9 chickens get weighed. The company wasn't 10 doing it, it wasn't letting us watch our 11 chickens get weighed. 12 I was on the horn to Jim Baker, 13 the former GIPSA administrator. 14 He said, "No, you have the right 15 to watch your chickens get weighed". 16 I knew that they were messing 17 with the weights in our complex, I knew 18 that they were doing that, but every time I 19 wanted to go and watch my chickens get 20 weighed they would never let me weight it. 21 And, as I understand it, the 22 complex manager even had to sign off that 23 we got to watch our chickens get weighed.

1 2 3 4 5 6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

I want to know why the Packers and Stockyards Act isn't working -administration does not have real penalties for me asking this question, for me to watch my chickens get weighed, and for a few other little things, they cut me off from growing business and cost me hundreds of thousands of dollars.

Where is the penalty to them? If they can weigh a chicken right should they even be allowed to weigh the chickens, you know. Maybe that function, that part of vertical integration should be taken away from them. If they can't weigh the feed right and give a ticket right to us, maybe that should be diversified -- you know, divested from their part of their integration.

If they can't handle their business correctly and want to cheat the farmer with their power, their market power that they have, that -- those parts just need to be taken away from them.

1 2 Stoc 3 proc

Now, I understand the Packers and Stockers Act is being undermined by this proof to harm in competition. When they're cheating all of these farmers out here, they're getting a monetary advantage in the market.

When they're all doing it they're colluding in that -- that -- in getting that advantage from the farmers. They're making money off of the farmers by farming the farmers and that gives them a comparative advantage to any new entrant in the market that wants to come in.

And, so, you know, they're colluding already. And that's the excuse that the federal judges say that we -- you know, that we can't have this law enforced.

I want to know something, do
these guys not know the difference between
or and and. Do they not think the people
who legislated this law know the difference
between or and and. I mean they did know
the difference.

These prohibitions were there so
that these companies right here could not
cheat the farmer to gain value and to be in
the marketplace competing with each other.

It reduces the price of the market that all
of the people get in the market.

And if I get cut off of chickens
I can't get ten other growers and go and
compete with them because they're cheating
growers to get a lower price.

I mean, this is ridiculous what's been happening with these federal judges in the court cases.

And, you know, if Congress needs to act -- I mean, they've acted time and time and time again, maybe we need to get rid of a few judges, maybe we need to get the House Judiciary Committee to take out some of these judges who are just siding with these corporations and cheating the family farmer.

I mean, what else can we do?
That's what the Constitution

allows and maybe the Justice Department 1 2 should ask for that. 3 MR. WEAVER: I don't know if 4 gentlemen were here for the last panel that 5 I was on. There's a couple of points that 6 I didn't get to finish on that panel that 7 I'd like to clarify for the folks here if 8 you don't mind. 9 And it's directed to you, too, 10 because these are things that you can have 11 input on, too, and, hopefully, make some 12 changes on. 13 They didn't give me the 14 opportunity to express my example about the 15 KFC price, \$26.99 for a 12-piece bucket of 16 chicken. And us, as growers, got 30 cents 17 of that. 18 And that being the case, there is 19 something fundamentally wrong with -- with 20 our private enterprise system here in this 21 country. 22 But when I do -- I had these

chickens by arrangement, I had them for at

23

1 least 35, 36 days.

The integrator has them for three days; the day they get them from the layer; the day they take them out of the hatchery bring to me; and the day the process them.

So, you know, where is the equity in that?

We've got them ten times longer than the integrators do and they make,
Lord, knows, how much more profit than we do because they'll never tell us.

And the example that I had of a settlement of 1985. I don't know if you gentlemen saw that.

We have proof that in 1985 growers were making 4.85 cents a pound.

And today our base pay is 5.05 cents, two-tenths of a cent a pound more than it was in 1985. How is that fair?

Look -- look how much all of other costs have increased, fuel, equipment, labor, taxes, insurance, but two-tenths of a cent a pound increase.

So we -- we have to rely -- we --

we can't do it as individuals. Even as
associations, we don't have the power or
the authority over the mega corporations
that run agriculture in this country that
you folks do. And to me, that's your job.
We need your help to change the
way that agriculture is run in this
country, you and the Department of Justice

way that agriculture is run in this
country, you and the Department of Justice.
I forgot, we had the Department of Justice
here, too. Please help us. We need your
help.

MR. MARK HUDSON: Hello. My name is Mark Hudson. I'm a poultry grower from Red Boiling Springs, Tennessee up near the Kentucky line. I've been involved in the poultry industry 2004. And, probably, as many here would tell you, I picked the absolute worst years to get -- to get into the poultry industry.

The issues I'd like to -- like to bring to light probably is as pertinet to GIPSA as it is to the finances.

As Professor Taylor alluded to

earlier, one of the unintended consequences

of vertical integration is that it has

created a blackhole of information.

In other words, those people that

-- that would be on that waiting list to

get into the poultry industry do not have

good and accurate information that is

unbiased from the industry.

Looking back into my own
mistakes, that would the chief mistake. I
did search at great length to find the
pertinent information, not just necessarily
just -- just the costs, but the units, how
many kilowatt hours of electricity, how
many gallons of gas per -- per house top.
I tried to find that information and that
information doesn't exist.

Both myself and my lender relied on the cash flow statement as delivered by the -- by the integrator.

Now, I think we've heard testimony numerous times today that those -- those particular cash flow instruments

1 are not accurate.

And both myself and the lender based their -- their decision to go with the loan and go into production on that particular document. That document wasn't accurate from the first flock that I placed and set.

I think their estimate, at that time, was that it would be a 28 -- 28 cents out of every dollar would go to cover my variable costs.

And that would leave me about at 72 -- 72 cents out of every dollar to handle my fixed costs, you know, my personal income and to maintain the facilities.

And the situation that we've got into on the facilities is that we have far exceeded thresholds of diminishing returns.

The capital investment of these facilities, while they may be greatly benefiting the integrator, are not returning any value to us whatsoever. We

need to compare that to the fact we're
making, you know, a very small fraction of

we were generating in income in 1985.

The poultry industry is in great danger of self-regulating itself because these truths as to how much it costs to operate things, and also the overhead cost and ability of income to sustain this, will tell on itself eventually unless something is changed about the industry.

So the industry representatives are here. This is a great threat to you. It's already a present threat to the growers, but if you want to continue to grow in the United States, you're going to have to find out how to overcome this.

It has been mentioned, you come sign on and you become a full partner with us, or you pay for the part that's going to return you some money and leave us the part of the investment that returns us some money, but we will have to partner on this.

There are parts of GIPSA issues

that may come up. You're facing a real 1 2 economic problem in the United States on 3 overhead and the inability to sustain that 4 overhead with income that you're returning 5 to us. So that would be my statement. 6 7 Thank you. 8 MR. FERRELL: Well, seeing that 9 no more folks wanting to provide comments, 10 suddenly you got bashful. No, I'm just 11 kidding. Well, I just want to thank 12 13 everybody for coming to today's competition 14 workshop. 15 I think we've heard a number of 16 issues today and we've learned a lot from 17 our panelists. And I thank them for taking 18 the time to participate today. 19 I especially want to thank the president of Alabama A&M and all the folks 20 21 here at the University that did everything 22 they could to get everything ready and they

did a great job. I thank them greatly for

23

1 doing that. 2 I also thank our folks at USDA 3 and DOJ for helping get all the logistics 4 and everything put together. 5 And, as I have said at the Iowa 6 workshop, I appreciate the good working 7 relationship we've had with the Department of Justice working on these issues and 8 9 looking forward on that. 10 I want to thank Congressman Davis 11 and Alabama Agricultural Commissioner Ron 12 Sparks for attending this morning. 13 And I'll just mention that our 14 next competition workshop will be held on 15 June 25th. And it will focus on 16 competition in diary issues in Madison, 17 Wisconsin. Then we'll have a livestock 18 19 competition workshop on August 27th in Fort 20 Collins, Colorado. 21 And then a workshop on margins on

December 8th in Washington, D. C.

I will turn it over to, Dudley,

22

23

or, Bill, if you have any comments.

MR. STALLINGS: I just want to reiterate on behalf of the Department of Justice our thanks to the Alabama A&M University. It's been truly a privilege for us to be here. And a lot of people put in a lot work behind the scenes to get this -- to get this event going and -- and I think it's been a really good and productive day today.

I especially want to thank all of you for coming here. We have heard throughout the day that there -- there is a real hardship in you being here, either for the fear of retaliation or just the mere fact of having to take a day off from work to come here and tell your story.

We have -- we have heard your stories, we -- we understand them, we appreciate them and we understand the importance of the issues that have been talked about here today.

So once, again, I just want to

1 thank you-all for -- for being here.

MR. DUDLEY: I'd just like to say that -- I want to reiterate and tell you a fact. The last time that the Packers and Stockyards Act was on a presidential agenda was on Woodrow Wilson's. That's back when it was passed.

The Act is on President Obama's agenda. I think we have shown today that we are serious about this to have the Secretary of Agriculture, to have the Attorney General, the Assistant Attorney General here. And for nothing else, it costs a lot of money to get them down here.

But they are very, very interested, as we are, in solving problems in agriculture. It is very important, not only to the industry, but to the producers, the farmers and the consumers and we're committed to do so.

And I want to thank all of you for taking time out of your busy schedules to come and visit with us and make

1	comments.
2	MR. WEAVER: We owe thanks to
3	these people right here. So they need a
4	really big hand.
5	
6	END OF HEARING
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	

1	$\underline{C} \underline{E} \underline{R} \underline{T} \underline{I} \underline{F} \underline{I} \underline{C} \underline{A} \underline{T} \underline{E}$
2	STATE OF ALABAMA)
3	SHELBY COUNTY)
4	I, ROBERT KEITH KENNEDY, Notary Public for the
5	State of Alabama at Large, hereby certify that I am the
6	Certified Court Reporter who made machine shorthand notes
7	of the foregoing proceedings at the time and place stated
8	in the Caption thereof; that I later reduced my shorthand
9	notes into typewriting; that the foregoing pages numbered
10	seven through three hundred eighty-eight, both inclusive,
11	contain a full, true, and correct transcript of proceedings
12	had on said occasion.
13	I further certify that I am in no way related
14	to nor employed by any of the parties, the witnesses or
15	counsel, and that I have no interest in the outcome of this
16	matter.
17	Given under my hand and seal this the
18	6th day of June 2010.
19	
20	
21	
22	Robert Keith Kennedy
23	CCR License No. 318 My Commission Expires September 5, 2010